DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 146 TM 840 062

AUTHOR Strahorn, Jack; Ireton, Leroy
TITLE Annual Evaluation Report of Federally-Funded Educational Programs, FY1983.
INSTITUTION Oklahoma State Dept. of Education, Oklahoma City. State-Federal Programs Div.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 94p.; For the 1981 and 1982 reports, see ED 216 016 and ED 226 038.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Adult Basic Education; Annual Reports; Bilingual Education; Career Education; Educational Facilities; Educational Objectives; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; Federal State Relationship; Lunch Programs; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Special Education; *State Agencies; State Federal Aid
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation and Improvement Act 1981; *Oklahoma; Title IX Education Amendments 1972

ABSTRACT

The State Education Agency of Oklahoma presents, as federally required, a report evaluating the results and effectiveness of the Oklahoma State-Federal Programs in the 1983 fiscal year. One purpose of this report is to give an indication of how the Division of State-Federal Programs accomplishes its mission to achieve the goals of Federal programs. A second purpose is to present information which will increase understanding of various Federal programs and facilitate efforts to keep abreast of new developments in Federal programs. A third purpose is to provide information which will show the degree of achievement of Division objectives. These must generally focus on the validation of the programs conducted by local education agencies; thus objectives are stated in terms of what is done at local levels. Data are presented concerning each of the programs utilizing Federal funds for their operation and are organized into information to fulfill each of the three purposes of the report. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240146

TM

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

Of Federally-Funded Educational Programs FY 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Craddock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 840 062

Oklahoma State Department of Education
Leslie Fisher, State Superintendent

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

OF FEDERALLY-FUNDED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Prepared by

STATE-FEDERAL PROGRAMS DIVISION

JACK STRAHORN, ASSOCIATE DEPUTY STATE SUPERINTENDENT

LEROY IRETON, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Edited by

PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION SECTION

LESLIE FISHER, STATE SUPERINTENDENT

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DECEMBER 1983

LESLIE FISHER
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
President and Executive Officer, State Board of Education

LLOYD GRAHAM, Deputy State Superintendent

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Dr. Leslie Fisher, President
Mrs. Winona Wettengel, Chief Executive Secretary
Mr. Burl Bartlett, Kingfisher
Mr. R. E. Carleton, Purcell
Mr. E. L. Collins, Idabel
Mrs. Barbara Johnson, Owasso
Mr. Seay Sanders, Midwest City
Dr. C. B. Wright, Stroud

STATE-FEDERAL PROGRAMS DIVISION

Jack Strahorn, Associate Deputy State Superintendent
Leroy Ireton, Director of Federal Programs

Basic information provided by the following Section Directors, Administrators, Deputy Administrators, and Coordinators:

Joe Birdwell
Glenda Barrett
James Casey
Jack Craddock
Tom Freeman
JoAnn Gordoni
Charles Greene
Keith Haley
Mattie Harrison
Frank Hobbs
Sam Homan
Leroy Ireton
Fred Jones
Bob Martin
Mary Miles
Ruby Nichols
Dean Niles
Pat Odell
Jimmie L.V. Prickett
Judy Salinas
Leo Shreck
Connie Siler
Keith Stone
Mary Jo Stewart
Travis Tice

Edited by PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION SECTION

James L. Casey, Administrator
Ame Gorena, Assistant Administrator
Howard Potts, Assistant Administrator
Mary Heaton, Administrative Assistant

This publication is printed by the Oklahoma State Department of Education as authorized by Leslie Fisher, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Three hundred copies have been prepared and distributed at a cost to the taxpayers of the State of Oklahoma of $811.08 ($2.70 cost per copy).

CONTENTS

Program	Contact Person	Page
FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN FY 1983		vii
INTRODUCTION		xi
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION	Mattie Harrison	1
BILINGUAL EDUCATION	Judy Salinas	7
CAREER EDUCATION	Charles Greene	11
CIVIL RIGHTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS - SEX DESEGREGATION, TITLE IX	Glenda Barrett	15
ECIA CHAPTER 1, PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS	Frank Hobbs	
EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN (Regular Chapter 1)	Joe Birdwell	17
MIGRANT EDUCATION	Keith Stone	19
NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, AND CORRECTIONAL	Joe Birdwell	23
EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT, RESOURCES AND SUPPORT	Leroy Ireton	
PART C-IMPROVEMENT IN LOCAL EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE	Ruby Nichols	25
HUMAN RELATIONS	Mary Miles	29
IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAMS - STATE BLOCK GRANTS (ECIA CHAPTER 2)	Leroy Ireton	33
INDIAN EDUCATION (JOHNSON-O'MALLEY)	Sam Homan	37
K-12 TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION	Travis Tice	41
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT TRANSITION SERVICES PROGRAM	James Casey	43
SCHOOL BUS DRIVER TRAINING PROGRAM	Pat Odell	47

Program	Contact Person	Page
SCHOOL LUNCH SECTION	Fred Jones	
CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM	Dean Niles	49
NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM	Tom Freeman	51
NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING	Mary Jo Stewart	53
SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM	Tom Freeman	55
SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM	Tom Freeman	57
SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN	Dean Niles	59
SCHOOL PLANT SERVICES SECTION	Bob Martin	61
IMPACT AID PROGRAM	Bob Martin	63
PUBLIC EDUCATION ENERGY PROGRAM		
ELEMENTARY ENERGY EDUCATION	Bob Martin	67
ENERGY CONSERVATION	Bob Martin	69
ENERGY GRANTS	Bob Martin	71
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS	Jimmie L.V. Prickett	
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS (EHA-PART B)	Connie Siler	75
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN STATE INSTITUTIONS (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)	Leo Shreck	79
PRE-SCHOOL INCENTIVE	JoAnn Gordoni	81
SERVICES FOR DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN	Connie Siler	85
TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED	Keith Haley	87
TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN	Leroy Ireton	89
SUMMARY		93

FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN FY 1983

Program (CFDA* Number)	Act	Title	Public Law
Adult Basic Education (84.002)	Adult Education Act	XIII-A	95-561
Bilingual Education (84.003)	ESEA 1965; Education Amendments of 1978	VII	95-561
Career Education (84.074)	Career Education Incentive Act		95-207
Child Care Food Program (10.558)	Child Nutrition Act 1978; Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981		95-627, 97-35
Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training Programs - Sex Desegration, Title IX (84.004)	Civil Rights Act of 1964; Education Amendments of 1972 Women's Educational Equity Act of 1978	IV, SEC. 403-405 IX IX, Part C	88-352 92-318 95-561
Educational Improvement, Resources and Support Part C (Improvement in LEA Practices)(84.089)	ESEA 1965; Education Amendments of 1978	IV-C	95-561
Educationally Deprived Children (Chapter 1, ECIA)(84.010)	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Chapter 1, Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981	Title V, Subtitle D	97-35
Educationally Deprived Children in State Administered Institutions Serving Neglected or Delinquent Children (Chapter 1, ECIA; Neglected and Delinquent)(84.013)	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Chapter 1, Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981	Title V, Subtitle D	97-35
Human Relations (84.004)	Civil Rights Act, 1964; Education Amendments of 1972	IV, Sec. 403 IX	88-352 92-318, 95-561
Impact Aid Program (84.041)	Federally Impacted Areas; Education Amendments of 1978	I, IV X	81-874 95-561
Improving School Programs - State Block Grants (Chapter 2)(84.151)	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Chapter 2, Subtitle D of Title X of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981	Title V, Subtitle D	97-35

*CFDA-Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN FY 1983 (Continued)

Program (CFDA Number)	Act	Title	Public Law
Indian Education (15.130)	Johnson O'Malley, 1934; Education Amendments of 1978	 XI	73-167 95-561
K-12 Traffic Safety Education (20.600)	National Highway Safety Act of 1966, Standards 3, 4, 14, 17		
Migrant Education (84.011) (Chapter 1, ECIA)	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Chapter 1, Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981	Title V, Subtitle D	97-35
National School Lunch Program (10.555)	National School Lunch Act of 1946, as amended; Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981		96-499, 97-35
Neglected or Delinquent Transition Services Programs (84.152)	Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965, Title I, Section 153, as amended by Education Amendment of 1978; Public Law 95-561	Title I, Section 153	95-561
Nutrition Education and Training Program (10.564)	Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended; Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981		95-166, 97-370, 97-35
Pre-School Incentive Grant (84.027)	Education of the Handicapped Act; Education Amendments of 1978	VI, Part B XIII, Part D, Sec. 1341	91-230, 93-380, 94-142 95-561
Program for Education of Handicapped Children in State Operated or Supported Schools (Chapter 1, ECIA)(84.009)	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Chapter 1, Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981	Title V, Subtitle D	97-35
Public Education Energy Programs Elementary Energy Education (81.050) Energy Conservation (81.041) Energy Grants (81.052)	Energy Policy and Conservation Act; Dept. of Energy Organization Act; National Energy Conservation Policy Act; National Energy Extension Service Act; Dept. of Energy Organization Act; National Energy Conservation Policy Act	III, Part C VI V III, Parts 1 and 2	94-163 95-91 95-619 95-39 95-91 95-619
School Breakfast Program (10.553)	Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended; Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981		96-499, 97-35

FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN FY 1983 (Continued)

Program (CFDA Number)	Act	Title	Public Law
School Bus Driver Training Program (20.600)	National Highway Safety Act of 1966; Standard 17, Pupil Transportation Safety		
Special Educational Programs and Projects for Handicapped Children in Public Schools (84.027)	Education of the Handicapped Act; Education Amendments of 1978	VI-B Part D, Sec. 1341	91-230, 93-380, 94-142 95-561
Special Educational Programs and Projects; Services for Deaf-Blind Children (84.025)	Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA)	VI-C	91-230
Special Educational Programs and Projects; Training for Teachers of the Handicapped (84.029)	Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA); as amended by Education Amendments of 1974, 1976, 1978	VI-D	91-230 93-380, 95-49, 95-561
Special Milk Program (10.556)	Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended; Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981		91-295, 93-150, 93-347, 94-105, 95-166, 95-627, 96-499, 97-35
Summer Food Service Program for Children (10.559)	National School Lunch Act, as amended; Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981		94-105, 95-166, 95-627, 97-379, 97-35
Transition Program for Refugee Children (84.146)	Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980 and the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982		96-212, 97-363

INTRODUCTION

The administration of federally funded programs at the State level is the responsibility of the Oklahoma Department of Education, Division of State-Federal Programs. The State Education Agency is required to demonstrate accountability through the preparation of "a report evaluating the results and effectiveness of programs assisted thereunder the preceding fiscal year."

The need for evaluation information has increased as people have demanded more accountability from the process of education. No force has had greater impact on the development and use of evaluation techniques than the requirement that federally funded programs be evaluated. Local education agencies participating in one or more of the federally-funded educational programs submit reports detailing the results of their efforts.

Models for evaluation emphasize the importance of having stated goals and objectives so that progress can be measured. Most of the Federal programs can be categorized under three major goals:

-- To equalize educational opportunity for groups and individuals who are educationally disadvantaged because of socioeconomic, physical, or mental handicapping conditions.

-- To improve the quality and relevance of American education through research, development, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination, and training.

-- To provide limited general support to selected education functions and activities such as libraries, state education agencies, school plant, basic skills training, local improvement programs, etc.

One purpose of this report is to give an indication of how the Division of State-Federal Programs accomplishes its mission to achieve the goals of Federal Programs. The Division serves generally through the use of the following processes:

-- Assisting local school personnel in planning and development of proposals and programs.

-- Sharing information and orienting prospective applicants in workshops and seminars.

-- Reviewing, revising, and approving applications for program funds in relation to State Plans and Federal Guidelines.

-- Assisting personnel with further development, implementation, evaluation, fiscal accounting, reporting, and dissemination relative to educational programs.

-- Providing office conferences, telephone consultations, field services, on-site visits, seminars, and workshops.

A second purpose of the report is to present information which will increase understanding of various Federal programs and facilitate efforts to keep abreast of new developments in Federal programs.

A third purpose of the report is to provide information which will show the degree of achievement of Division objectives. These must generally focus on the validation of the programs conducted by local education agencies. Thus the Division objectives are stated in terms of what is done at local levels. The activities of the Division are designed to:

-- Ensure that the scope of local programs is adequate to accomplish the purpose of the program.

-- Facilitate the development of objectives whose accomplishment will achieve the goals of the programs.

-- Validate the local evaluation of programs to ensure that programs have accomplished objectives and that evaluation information is used to further improve programs.

-- Monitor activities designed to involve participants and other citizens in planning and implementing programs. Also monitored is the dissemination of information about programs.

On the following pages, data are presented about each of the programs utilizing Federal funds for their operation. In the Summary pages the data are organized into information to fulfill each of the three purposes of the report.

For further information, contact the office of the section providing the specific program services or the Office of the Associate Deputy Superintendent, State-Federal Programs Division, Oliver Hodge Memorial Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Statutory Designation

Adult Education Act, Title XIII-A of Public Law 95-561

Purpose

The Adult Education Program is organized upon a state-wide needs assessment which was conducted by the State Department of Education Adult Basic Education Section, the Steering Committee of the Participatory Planning Task Force, and the Local Adult Learning Centers.

Program priorities were determined by the Steering Committee of the Task Force from data collected in Needs Assessment.

The primary goal of the Three Year Plan was to reach as many of those persons in the 0-8 grade level as possible. We projected in the plan that 37,500 persons would be served during the three years. We greatly exceeded this number by serving 58,300 and of this number 47,628 were in the Level 1 group. Much of this increase continues to be the result of the Outreach program years (FY 81,82,83).

Education Needs of Adults in Oklahoma (25 years of age and older)

Grade Level Completed	1970	1978	1980
No formal education	17,322	18,856	20,201
1-4 grade level	62,209	68,545	72,980
5-7 grade level	149,973	164,847	179,490
8th grade level	188,663	206,156	324,970
1-3 yrs. high school	269,125	299,001	277,314
Total less than high school			34.04%

State Allocation of Federal Funds

	Federal	State
FY-1979	$1,198,479	-0-
FY-1980	1,315,509	-0-
FY-1981	1,315,509	-0-
FY-1982	1,315,509	$146,300
FY 1983	1,143,443	174,300

Scope

Forty-one (41) local education agencies were established to serve as area Adult Learning Centers for two hundred and fifteen (215) local educational agencies in the state. The area Adult Learning Centers and their Satellites are as follows:

Adult Learning Center	Satellites
Ada	Byng, Allen, New Bethel
Altus	Hollis, Granite, Frederick, Tipton, Snyder
Anadarko	Cordell, Kiowa Vo-Tech, Ft. Cobb, Carnegie, Lookeba, Sickles, Binger, Caddo
Ardmore	Marietta, Healdton, Ringling, Davis
Bartlesville	Ramona, Copan, Nowata
Chickasha	Alex
Clinton	Weatherford, Cordell
Drumright	Sperry, Sapulpa, Broken Arrow, Cushing, Mounds, Kellyville, Central Vo-Tech, Owasso, Cleveland, Chandler, Bristow, Okemah, Prague, Keystone
Duncan	Walters, Waurika, Marlow, Velma-Alma, Grandfield
Durant	Atoka, Coalgate, Madill, Milburn, Kingston
Elk City	Hobart, Western Vo-Tech, Hammon, Erick, Sayre Jr. College
Enid	Helena, Cherokee
Fairview	Alva Vo-Tech, Pond Creek, Hennessey
Guymon	
Hugo	Ft. Towson, Grant, Nashoba
Idabel	Valliant, Wright City, Haworth, Smithville
Lawton	Cache, Pleasant Valley
McAlester	Haileyville, Kiowa, Calvin, Canadian, Eufaula
Moore	Edmond, Mustang, Millwood, El Reno Vo-Tech, Yukon, Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City Community College, Choctaw
Muskogee	Taft, Haskell, Checotah, Wagoner, Okay, Ft. Gibson
Norman	Noble, Central State Hospital, Mental Health Center, Moore-Norman Vo-Tech

Adult Learning Center	Satellites
Oklahoma City	Eighteen (18) local satellites within Oklahoma City School District
Okmulgee	Oklahoma Technical Center, Senior Citizens' Home
Pauls Valley	Lindsay, Wynnewood, Stratford, Wayne, Sulphur, Maysville, Purcell, Lexington Prison, Elmore Vo-Tech.
Pawhuska	Barnsdall
Poteau	Cameron, Arkoma, Spiro, Ft. Coffee, Pocola, Heavener
Ponca City	Tonkawa
Pryor	Chelsea, Oak Hill, Claremore, Colcord, Cherokee Heights, Bull Hollow, Kenwood, Ballau, Jay, Vinita, Eucha, Commerce, Catoosa, Grove
Sallisaw	Stilwell, Muldrow, Marble City, Roland, Vian, Westville
Shawnee	Wanette, Tecumseh, Harrah, Wellston, Boley
Stigler	Kinta
Stillwater	Pawnee, Fairfax, Perkins-Tyron, Stillwater Sheltered Workshop
Tahlequah	Sheltered Workshop
Talihina	Fanshawe
Tulsa	Nineteen (19) Local Satellites within City System, Sand Springs, Skiatook
Watonga	Geary, Okarche
Wewoka	Konawa, Seminole
Wilburton	Red Oak
Woodward	Fargo

There were 13,948 adults participating in the Adult Education Program through the Adult Learning Centers and their satellites. The participants by learning level were as follows:

Level 1: 10,025 Level 2: 3,923

Kind of projects or components with number of learner participants per component:

Elementary & Junior High (ABE)	1,679	Learning Center	3,482
Secondary	3,982	Correctional Institution	571
Community College	322	Other locations	3,912

The Adult Learning Centers were served by the following personnel:

State Department of Education	4
Local Administrators	45
Professional (Teachers)	431
Paraprofessional	41

The administrator, deputy administrator and two (2) coordinators are available at all times for technical advice, workshops and inservice programs. The deputy administrator and two (2) coordinators are available to their specified areas of the state to give the Learning Centers any assistance they may request. They provide assistance in the methods and techniques of recruitment of classes, advice upon new curriculum which has been developed and give assistance with reports which are required by the state and federal offices of Adult Education.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

We feel that all goals and objectives have been met and exceeded in all cases. The extent of the excess was more than we thought possible. The number of people served has increased each year.

The State Adult Advisory Council has carried out the functions set forth in the state plan. Among those functions are:

-- Advise the State Department of Education on the administration and implementation of the state plan;

-- Assess the data compiled by the task force to determine the most acute areas and target populations of the state for participation in adult programs;

-- Advise upon the improving of the reporting of state and local programs;

-- Assure that the state plan programs are meeting the needs of the community; and

-- Advise upon the priority of all 310 projects. All expenses of the Adult Education Advisory council come from non-federal funds.

Special Emphasis Areas:

Skills related A.B.E. classes:

The number enrolled in skills related classes far exceeded our projection. The actual number of participants for the three years has more than doubled the number we projected.

Adults with limited English speaking ability:

The increase in the number of limited English speaking adults has been far above our projection. Our original projections have been exceeded many times over for the three year period.

Flexible class scheduling:

More daytime classes than we projected have been added to care for those whose work prevents night attendance. All classes are operated on open-entry, open-exit basis. Besides extra daytime classes, we have added two sheltered workshops in Tahlequah and Stillwater.

Institutionalized Adults:

Due to increased numbers served in the Department of Corrections, our projections were dwarfed by the actual participation of Lexington, Hodgens, Helena, and El Reno.

G.E.D. Preparation:

The number of participants in this area is simply a matter of available funds.

Child Care and Transportation:

We have no problem in these areas. The various community agencies have taken care of these thus far. Churches are helping in child care as well as community agencies.

The lack of adequate funds is always a problem. Many of our centers had to cut some classes short because the funds allocated were not sufficient to complete the program they desired. All funds are distributed to be matched on a ninety (90) to ten (10) ratio. Funds were allocated to Local Learning Centers on the basis of an approved application. Decrease in funds in FY 83 has meant fewer classes and a small decrease in attendance. There has been no problem with the evaluation of each of our Learning Centers. Each coordinator monitors each of the centers in his/her assigned area of the state throughout the year. The Learning Center submits an evaluation report at the end of each fiscal year.

For evaluating the effectiveness of the program in academic standards, many standardized tests are used as well as teacher evaluations. Some of the standardized tests used are:

Stanford-Binet	California Achievement Test
S.R.A. Achievement Series	Metropolitan Achievement Test
Jordan Reading Survey	Performance Level

Observed changes in target participants can be documented in the following terms:

8,374 - completed A.B.E. program through the eighth grade

4,883 - passed G.E.D. examination

59 - graduated from high school after starting A.B.E. program

257 - registered to vote for the first time

42 - became U.S. citizens

1,025 - obtained a better job or salary increase

346 - were removed from public assistance

1,216 - employed as a result of the A.B.E. program

The average cost per student for FY 83 was $70.86.

The average cost per student for the Three Year period was $70.60.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Statutory Designation

Bilingual Education Act; Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, amended by Public Law 93-380; 20 U.S.C. 880b

Purpose

To develop and implement elementary and secondary school programs, including activities at the preschool level, to meet the educational needs of children of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and to demonstrate effective ways of providing such children instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in English

Federal Grant Totals:

(Grants are awarded directly to LEAs, IHEs and SEAs.)

FY 1979	$ 700,796
FY 1980	698,763
FY 1981	1,088,692
FY 1982	2,141,951
FY 1983	2,252,686

Scope

The total number of Local Education Agency (LEA) projects is twelve (12). Other than the three (3) projects in Oklahoma City and the project in Lawton, each represents a consortium of several rural school districts.

The estimated number of children served is 5,000 including children enrolled from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Not every project serves the same grade levels. Each project is funded on a continuation basis, i.e., initial funding is projected for a three year cycle, and, since certain projects have been in operation longer than other projects, termination of their Federal funding period will occur sooner than for those other projects.

The State Department of Education (SDE) allocation is intended to assist LEA projects through coordination of monitoring, liaison with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), dissemination of information and successful practices, and coordination of services, funded from other sources, to Limited English Proficient (LEP) children.

Representative Objectives

The various American Indian projects have developed special historical/cultural/linguistic classroom materials which have been utilized to strengthen the children's self-identity and image as well as improve their English language skills.

Oklahoma City has utilized its Title VII and Title I funds to upgrade language arts, reading and mathematics scores for its Hispanic children while providing culturally relevant in-school programs in target schools.

The SDE has continued to develop, implement and support the following objectives, goals and projects:

An annual statewide conference on Bilingual Education
A handbook for school administrators
A handbook for the classroom teacher
An assistance program in English as a Second Language (ESL) for all LEAs enrolling a Limited English Proficient (LEP) student
An extensive in-service program series
A coordinated application procedure for supplemental project funding and assistance from Title VII multi-functional resource centers
A Bilingual Education Advisory Council to suggest directions for the SDE in providing services to Title VII Projects and schools as well as Limited English Proficient (LEP) students

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Linguistic and cultural differences among children have frequently been tantamount to poor self-image in those children who are noticeably different. The manifestation in an academic setting of that poor self-image has often meant increased difficulty in the academic areas of school. The results of this program are, thereby, quite often subjective and intangible, making a measurement of effectiveness difficult by any standardized means. Directors of the various projects and their teachers, however, increasingly report the following results from their schools:

Parents become more actively involved and participate in their children's schooling.
Dropout rates decrease.
Dropouts return to school.
Better and more positive community-school relationships are realized.
Students both project and possess a better self-concept.
Teacher attitudes become more positive and thereby also improve.
Student scholastic achievement is improved.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Although the LEA and IHE projects are directly funded from Washington through the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs and are directly responsible to the United States Department of Education, LEAs have fully cooperated with every effort of the SDE to coordinate activities and disseminate vital information between and among the projects and other interesed parties.

Examples are:

Unified requests for assistance from regional dissemination and resource centers
Development of the Oklahoma Association for Bilingual Education
Participation in the development of a state plan
Assistance and participation in a statewide annual conference/workshop
Complete cooperation in monitoring visits to school sites
Presentations at various educational meetings and conferences

Many schools previously not involved in any way with bilingual education have become involved in varying degrees. The SDE has assisted the administrators, faculty members and office staffs of these nonparticipating schools by providing services to their Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

Among the responsibilities of the SDE in the area of dissemination are: schedules of SDE workshops, conferences, and in-service training; lists of network-developed products; information about existing and proposed state laws, regulations, designs and plans pertinent to bilingual education; information about universities and colleges offering bilingual teacher-training programs; information on state certification and reciprocity requirements for bilingual education; information about demographic, testing, racial and ethnic data on Oklahoma's LEP children; proposal review; information on other pertinent programs within the SDE; lists of Title VII projects, applicants, and state-funded bilingual programs to Centers serving them; and schedules of activities sponsored by Title VII system members.

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Common Name for the Program

Career Education

Statutory Designation

Career Education Incentive Act, Public Law 95-207

Purpose

The grant from the U.S. Office of Education to the Oklahoma State Department of Education was for program support at both the State educational agency and the local educational agencies in the following areas:

State Level

I. Employing such additional State Educational Agency personnel as may be required for the administration and coordination of programs;

II. Providing state leadership for career education by:

A. Conducting in-service institutes for educational personnel;

B. Training local career education coordinators;

C. Collecting, evaluating, and disseminating career education materials on an intrastate and interstate basis with special emphasis on overcoming sex bias and stereotyping;

D. Conducting statewide needs assessment and evaluation studies;

E. Conducting statewide career education leadership conferences;

F. Engaging in collaborative relationships with other agencies of State government and with public agencies and private organizations representing business, labor, industry, and the professions and organizations representing the handicapped, minority groups, women, and older Americans; and

G. Promoting the adaptation of teacher-training curricula to the concept of career education by institutions of higher education located in the State.

III. Making payments to local educational agencies for comprehensive programs including:

A. Instilling career education concepts and approaches in the classroom;

B. Developing and implementing comprehensive career guidance, counseling, placement, and followup services utilizing counselors, teachers, parents, and community resource personnel;

C. Developing and implementing collaborative relationships with organizations representing the handicapped, minority groups, and women and with all other elements of the community, including the use of personnel from such organizations and the community as resource persons in schools and for student field trips into that community;

D. Developing and implementing work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration, if such work experiences are related to existing or potential career opportunities and do not displace other workers who perform such work;

E. Employing coordinators of career education in local educational agencies or in combinations of such agencies (but not the individual school building level);

F. Training of local career education coordinators;

G. Providing in-service education for educational personnel, especially teachers, counselors, and school administrators, designed to help such personnel to understand career education, to acquire competencies in the field of career education and to acquaint such personnel with the changing work patterns of men and women, ways of overcoming sex stereotyping in career education, and ways of assisting women and men to broaden their career horizons;

H. Conducting institutes for members of boards of local educational agencies, community leaders, and parents concerning the nature and goals of career education;

I. Purchasing instructional materials and supplies for career education activities;

J. Establishing and operating community career education councils;

K. Establishing and operating career education resource centers serving both students and the general public;

L. Adopting, reviewing, and revising local plans for coordinating the implementation of the local comprehensive program; and

M. Conducting needs assessments and evaluations.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1980	$ 210,313
FY 1981	158,644
FY 1982	121,756
FY 1983	120,548

Scope

The Oklahoma State Department of Education employed a Career Education Coordinator on July 1, 1979. The Coordinator is assigned to the Guidance and Counseling Section which has six staff persons with a number of responsibilities including technical assistance in career education. The Career Education Coordinator has the responsibility for the administration, coordination and evaluation of all career education programs in the local educational agencies.

To distribute the Career Education Incentive Act funds to the local educational agencies, the State Department of Education established a procedure requiring the local educational agencies to submit an application which included an assurance of the maintenance of effort, status of private nonprofit school participation, needs assessment, goal, objectives, activities, evaluation design, dissemination plan, and budget. The Career Education Advisory Committee evaluated the applications and recommended that the State Board of Education award subgrants to the following 21 local educational agencies for the 1981-82 academic year:

School District	Amount	School District	Amount
Broken Arrow	$5,000	Noble	$5,000
Catoosa	5,000	Oilton	5,000
Cushing	5,000	Oklahoma City	5,000
Enid	5,000	Owasso	5,000
Foyil	5,000	Pauls Valley	5,000
Hilldale	5,000	Perkins-Tryon	5,000
Holdenville	5,000	Pryor	2,466
Indiahoma	5,000	Sasakwa	5,000
Jenks	5,000	Westville	5,000
Liberty Muldrow	5,000	Wyandotte	5,000
Moss	5,000	TOTAL	$102,466

Representative Objectives

The State Department of Education Career Education Coordinator will:

-- Conduct an awareness inservice for local educational agency administrators;

-- Develop a program for inservice training of local educational agency Career Education Coordinators;

-- Identify and disseminate information about exemplary programs; and

-- Design and implement an evaluation of the career education program.

The local educational agency career education programs will:

-- Instill career education concepts and approaches in the classroom;

-- Provide inservice education for educational personnel, especially teachers, counselors and school administrators, designed to help such personnel to understand career education, to acquire competencies in the field of career education and to acquaint such personnel with the changing work patterns of men and women, ways of overcoming sex stereotyping in career education and ways of assisting women and men to broaden their career horizons; and

-- Purchase instructional materials and supplies for career education activities.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Each project was evaluated by a team of three persons composed of people from the State Department of Education and the State Career Education Advisory Committee. During the evaluation visits, the LEA career education staff gave an overview of their goals and objectives. A period of time was set aside during each evaluation to have personal interviews with teachers and students and to examine records, activities, and reports. The projects administered pre-tests at the beginning of the school year to measure student's knowledge and awareness of careers. They administered post-tests during the last quarter of the school year to measure how much knowledge and awareness had been gained.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The information was disseminated through the Oklahoma Educator, Superintendent's Newsletter, and the daily newspapers.

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

Statutory Designation

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV, Section 403 of Public Law 88-352

Purpose

To provide technical assistance to requesting school districts in procedural compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318, and to facilitate sex-fair educational practices in the state through inservice training for educators

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$ 0
FY 1980	0
FY 1981	57,738
FY 1982	59,527
FY 1983	78,162

Scope

The Educational Equity Section of the State Department of Education is staffed with one coordinator and one full-time secretary.

All school districts in the state are served by the project. The following services are available: technical assistance with Title IX compliance; inservice training workshops for teachers; library media specialists; counselors and administrators in the areas of compliance and equity infusion into existing curriculum; and presentations at various civic organizations. These services are closely coordinated with the Oklahoma Vocational-Technical Education Division and the Technical Assistance Center of the Southwest, and the Title IV-CRA Race Desegregation Project at the Department.

During Fiscal Year 1983, this project provided intensive training in the above-cited areas to 143 school districts and involved 253 classroom teachers, counselors, school superintendents, principals and other school administrative staff. The impact of the training should reach approximately 23,000 students.

Representative Objectives

The objectives of this project are:

-- To increase the understanding of sex bias in education and develop methods to promote sex-fairness in teaching and curriculum through identification of sex bias and stereotypes in teaching materials and technique; training counselors in the use of sex-fair counseling materials and techniques; and informing students, parents and community about Title IX;

-- Resolution of problems occasioned with meeting the requirements of Title IX by providing technical assistance to requesting LEAs; and

-- Identification and development of an effective sex desegregation resource base within the state by placing appropriate educational equity supplemental teaching aides in the SEA Media Resource Center for teacher use.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The effectiveness of this program is measured by the following factors:

1. Commitment of school administrators as evidenced by the numbers of classroom teachers granted released time to attend the workshops;

2. Better understanding of Title IX compliance requirements and implementation as evidenced by reduced numbers of noncompliance complaints and/or investigations from the Office of Civil Rights;

3. Increased requests for information and/or presentations on sex-fair educational practices from LEAs, as well as professional, student, and civic organizations; and

4. SEA curriculum specialists incorporate sex equity concepts into their specific curriculum training workshops for teachers.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Program activities and implementation involve the cooperation and coordination with the State Department of Vocational-Technical Education sex equity coordinator, the Technical Assistance Center of the Southwest, and appropriate SEA staff.

Dissemination of project services and activities is achieved through articles in the Oklahoma Educator, Superintendent's Newsletter and the project brochure.

EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN
(Compensatory Education)

Common Name of the Program

Chapter I

Statutory Designation

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, Chapter 1; Public Law 97-35

Purpose

To provide opportunities for educationally deprived children to increase academic achievement through participation in comprehensive innovative programs

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	Part A	$28,764,887	(ESEA Title I)
FY 1980	A	31,270,665	(ESEA Title I)
FY 1981	A	32,651,166	(ESEA Title I)
FY 1982	A	33,115,599	(ESEA Title I)
FY 1983	A	31,492,311	(ESEA Chapter I)

Scope

Number of approved projects 584
Number of school districts participating. . . . 584
Number of districts who received allocations. . 616

The duplicated number of participants - 79,693 - includes students from preschool through high school.

Unduplicated number of participants by grade level:

Grade	Number of Participants
PK	198
KG	493
1	4,249
2	7,313
3	8,747
4	8,577
5	8,805
6	7,302
7	6,429
8	5,264
9	2,554
10	1,741
11	1,088
12	837
TOTAL	63,597

Total FTE state and local staff:

State Department of Education professionals	6.43
State Department of Education clerical	3.70
Local educational agency certified staff	1,354.93
Local educational agency noncertified	593.09

The different kinds of projects or components had the following number of learner participants per component:

	Regular Term	Summer	Total
Reading	44,755	1,706	46,461
Language Arts	10,257	708	10,965
Math	20,739	1,528	22,267
TOTAL	75,751	3,942	79,693

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The achievement scores reported for participants in each component reflects a significant gain. As compared to a "0" NCE gain as normal without provision of special services being provided, the following average NCE gains were made by Chapter 1 participants.

Reading 6.52 Language Arts 5.48 Math 7.58

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

During FY 1983, 3,020 parents of participants were involved in their child's education by assisting in planning, implementing, and evaluating Chapter 1 services. Services continue to be offered through small classes with instructors trained to remediate in reading, math and language arts. Instructors are able to concentrate services on an individual basis at the problem area and are not limited to meeting the general needs of the student body as a whole. Inservice is provided for Chapter 1 personnel, parents of participants, and locally funded teachers who also work with Chapter 1 students.

Some samples and types of dissemination efforts are:

PAC meetings
Open House
Home visits
Television
Radio
Newspapers
PTA meetings
Education Fairs

MIGRANT EDUCATION

Common Name of the Program

Migrant Education

Statutory Designation

Education, Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981; Chapter I

Purpose

Goals for migrant education are based on legislative mandates to establish programs of instructional and supportive service for the children of migratory workers seeking seasonal or temporary employment in agricultural and fishery related activities. The mobility of migratory children requires agreement among states in the development of comprehensive national goals. Each state is responsible for developing a state plan for migrant education which reflects the national program goals in order to assure educational continuity through coordination of programs and projects among the states. Local project objectives provide a base for project activities which fulfill state objectives and national goals.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$1,029,481
FY 1980	1,676,714
FY 1981	1,941,750
FY 1982	2,452,854
FY 1983	2,084,926

Scope

The number of staff working in the migrant program was as follows: Teachers 71; Aides 61; Directors 34; and Support Personnel 32. The program was also assisted by an Administrative Officer who worked out of his office located in Mangum. The total number of staff was 203.

There were thirty-four (34) project schools who received subgrants under this program for the FY 83 school year. They were: Altus, Arnett (Hollis), Binger, Blair, Boise City, Burns Flat, Butler, Clinton, Custer, Davidson, Eakly, Eldorado, Felt, Frederick, Fort Cobb, Gould, Grandfield, Granite, Hobart, Hollis, Lookeba-Sickles, Mangum, Martha, Olustee, Oney-Albert, Ryan, Sentinel, Snyder, Southside, Temple, Terral, Washington, Waurika and Weaver.

All projects and on-site schools within each project had a math, reading and language arts component. Most projects and schools had counseling and career components also. The objective of all components was to increase the grade level of migrant students and to meet the special educational needs of these deprived children in order that they

might better their relationships with their peers. Because of their migratory status (moving so much), limited English proficiency, poor diet and health, low socio-economic status, low self-esteem and little motivation, migrant children are among if not the most educationally deprived.

Within the 34 projects, there were forty five (45) on-site schools and 6,599 migrant students served. The state average per pupil expenditure was $2,561. The level of children served were pre-kindergarten through secondary (grades 7-12). Most of the children served were in the elementary (grades 1-6).

Categories of Children Served

	Migrant Status	Under 4 Years	4 Years	5-12 Years	18-21 Years	Total
I.	Interstate	120	115	2,361	18	2,614
II.	Intrastate	88	77	2,031	17	2,213
III.	Five-Year	73	57	1,609	33	1,772
	Total	281	249	6,001	68	6,599

SDE Representative Objectives

-- To identify every child who can be legally described as a "migratory child" and involve them in a migrant program

-- To identify and recruit every child who can be legally described as a "migratory child" and enter useful information in the National Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS)

-- To assist all agencies concerned with migrant education to properly utilize MSRTS data in order to minimize repetitious services and to enhance continuity in the instructional and supportive programs for migrant children

-- To develop and write a state plan for migrant education in order to qualify for federal funds available to SEAs in the form of grants made on the basis of entitlements under Chapter I, ECIA of 1981

-- To improve migrant programs through pre-service and in-service training of program staff

-- To improve migrant education programs by conducting assessments of needs and evaluation procedures that are consistent with State and National goals

-- To improve migrant education through continual updating of services and involving others in planning for Migrant Program changes

-- To subgrant funds to LEAs in order that they might establish programs of instruction and supportive services to meet the needs of children of agricultural workers that they may, through

education, be provided the skills to overcome their handicaps and take better advantage of their opportunities.

LEA Representative Objectives

-- To provide individualized instruction in the basic skills area according to the needs of the students in order to improve their opportunity to function at a level equal to their potential

-- To provide a program utilizing every available federal, state and local resource in order to improve conditions and cultural relationships among migrant children

-- To provide supportive services which will encourage and promote each migrant student's social growth, positive self-concept and group interaction skills

-- To improve reading, math, and language arts comprehension by at least one grade level or show a gain in normal-curve-equivalent (NCE) scores as evidenced by standardized tests, teacher-made tests and teacher observation

-- To provide counseling and career services that will help each migrant child to improve effectiveness in communicating written, oral and cultural expressions

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

In most instances, there were significant gains in meeting the needs of migrant students as identified in the scope of the program. Students are gaining grade levels desired, improving their oral and written skills, and making significant gains in certain academic areas. Above all, migrant students are being accepted by their peers and other children. In projects that have migrant programs, it is reported that students are feeling and experiencing being wanted more and more. Participating schools are reporting that the migrant program is one of the most effective federal programs that they have.

Because of the migratory nature of some migrant children and their families, achievement scores are low and do not reflect an accurate assessment of student ability. Most migrant children are very bright, studious, hard-wroking and honest. However, it is difficult to record and report student gains because they cannot be both pre and post tested because of movement and poor attendance. Efforts are being made to improve evaluation procedures that will facilitate collecting the data needed to more accurately report student gains.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Parents are involved in the overall development of the migrant program. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) recommend parents to serve on the State Migrant Parent Advisory council. LEAs invite and encourage local parents to belong and participate in local council activities. LEAs make home visits and schedule many special events to solicit

parental participation in the program and the identification and recruitment process.

An average of four (4) workshops is conducted annually to facilitate training in: basic skills (reading, math, language arts, ESL) and Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) activities. As a result of inservice activities, there is general agreement among the staff that the program has produced: (1) an improved understanding of and heightened sensitivity to the problems and needs of disadvantaged migrant children, (2) a higher level of academic achievement on the part of migrant children as a result of language skills usage, and (3) a new awareness in the total community of the problems related to migrants and education in the low socio-economic areas.

Dissemination of information by the SDE and participating projects is accomplished by several means. Mail-outs and memos are the most common. Any vital information and/or news stories may be published in the two State Department of Education publications--The Oklahoma Educator and the Superintendent's Newsletter. A Migrant Administrators' Handbook has been developed and distributed and is available upon request.

Participating projects take advantage of every type of local media that is available. Some report to newspapers, others to school publications, local radio, and local television. The Oklahoma State Department of Education has developed a comprehensive consolidated evaluation reporting system for soliciting data from LEAs for all federally funded programs.

General efforts for reporting statewide and local involvement and dissemination activities are accomplished through education fairs, newsletters, newspapers, school publications, advisory councils, brochures and other printed materials.

NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT AND CORRECTIONAL

Statutory Designation

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, Chapter 1, Neglected, Delinquent, and Correctional; Public Law 97-35

Purpose

To provide supplementary educational opportunities which meet the educational needs of students adjudicated to state institutions

State Allocation of Federal Funds

	Neglected	Delinquent	Correctional
FY 1979	$291,161	$185,867	$204,686
FY 1980	283,228	174,332	173,983
FY 1981	240,744	186,063	147,886
FY 1982	208,268	192,250	165,904
FY 1983	229,936	206,674	141,018

Scope

Three state NEGLECTED institutions:

L. E. Rader Center, Sand Springs
Oklahoma Children's Center, Taft
Whitaker State Children's Home, Pryor

Two state DELINQUENT institutions:

Boley State School for Boys, Boley
Central Oklahoma Juvenile Treatment Center, Tecumseh

Four state CORRECTIONAL institutions:

Oklahoma State Reformatory, Granite
Lexington Correctional Center, Lexington
Joseph Harp Correctional Center, Lexington
Conner Correctional Center, Hominy

There were 605 participants (unduplicated count) served in three component areas: reading, language arts and math.

Duplicated count of participants by curriculum area was as follows:

Reading	521
Language Arts	98
Math	97
Total	716

Staffing for these programs include:

Administrators	.90
Teachers	17.00
Aides	5.50

The State Department of Education staff members are involved in administration of N, D & C projects as well as providing administrative services to other Chapter 1 programs.

State Department of Education certified	6.43
State Department of Education noncertified	3.70

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The determination of student achievement in N, D & C programs using objective test measurement is very difficult for many reasons; the major being the length of time available for instruction and movement from institution to institution or release without evaluation of student progress. Subject evaluation of program success by project staff indicates student achievement in each component area.

LIBRARIES, LEARNING RESOURCES,
EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS
ESEA TITLE IV, PART C

Common Name of the Program

Improvement in Local Educational Practice

Statutory Designation

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 304 of Title III, Public Law 89-10, as amended by Public Law 91-230, as amended by Public Law 93-380, as amended by Public Law 95-561

Purpose

This program was designed to provide assistance to schools in the development, implementation, and demonstration of activities designed to address serious educational problems in elementary and secondary schools. Subgrants were awarded on a competitive basis. Funds for the 1982-83 school year were actually awarded to LEAs in April, 1982. This report provides information about projects operated in this program.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$1,373,980	
FY 1980	1,413,777	
FY 1981	1,411,002	
FY 1982	669,524	
FY 1983	-0-	(Projects funded with FY 82 carry-over)

Scope

In FY 1983, there were 78 Title IV-C subgrants awarded. Seventy-three of the subgrants were awarded to public schools to serve needs of children attending the public schools and five were awarded to public school districts to serve the needs of private, nonpublic school children within district boundaries.

Project Participation	Participants in Projects
Public Elementary School Children	18,151
Private Elementary School Children	533
Public Secondary School Children	15,688
Private Secondary School Children	1,074
Early Childhood Children	963
Handicapped Children	2,569
Vocational Education Children	1,363
Public Elementary School Teachers	309
Private Elementary School Teachers	5
Public Secondary School Teachers	194
Private Secondary School Teachers	4

Type of Project	Size (Enrollment) of LEA Under 599	600 - 4999	5000 - over
Developmental Innovative	8	6	6
Adopter	2	2	2
Continuation	17	20	9
Developer Demonstrator	1	2	2

Title IV-C projects cover a wide area of the curriculum in such content areas as reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Interest in computer technology prompted several school districts to broaden existing implementation efforts or to implement projects in this area. Twenty-four Title IV-C projects are devoted to various computer teaching/learning concepts areas.

Approximately 16 percent of our total funds were spent in the area of handicapped students' assessed needs.

Some other areas covered in funded projects include the following:

Energy
Staff Development
Guidance and Counseling
Gifted and Talented
Library Resources
Practical and Survival Skills
Developer Demonstrators and Adoptions
Early Childhood Education
The Arts and Music
Career Education
Dropout Prevention
Special Education
Environmental Education
Cooperatives

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The Proposal Writing Conferences sponsored by the State Department of Education in previous years have increased Local Education Agency personnel's expertise in proposal writing and program evaluation procedures. This conference has been an effective public relations linkage between LEAs, Title IV-C, the Planning, Research and Evaluation Section, and the Communications Section of the State Department of Education.

Many LEAs were able to show significant success as a result of local projects.

Three projects have been nationally validated. They are: "Go Metric" at Tulsa City Schools; "Project STAY" at Moore, and the "Child Service Demonstration Project for Secondary L.D. Students" at Cushing.

Four projects have been state validated. These are located at Liberty (Muldrow), Putnam City, Purcell, and Tulsa City Schools.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

In all Title IV-C projects faculty and student involvement was encouraged and community involvement was stressed. Private nonpublic schools located within the participating IV-C public school boundaries were advised of their eligibility to participate and invited to attend a planning and program implementation meeting. All projects utilized community and staff advisory council members.

An annual Education Fair was held with most projects represented. District project personnel made a formal presentation or exhibited from a demonstrator station.

Dissemination activities are an important part of each project. Each district is asked to explain their proposed dissemination plans. Upon approval, each district prepares and prints a brochure for community awareness and for State Department dissemination outside the community boundaries to other districts in the State and the Nation.

The Statewide Facilitator plays an important role in disseminating nationally validated projects and has worked very effectively in promoting adoptions.

Dissemination of project purposes, activities, and results is accomplished by the LEAs and the SEA via:

Newspaper Publications
Radio
Television
Brochures
Educational Directories of Projects
Education Fair
Booklets
On-Site Visitations
Demonstrations
Oklahoma Educator
Personal Contacts

HUMAN RELATIONS

Statutory Designation

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV, Section 403, of Public Law 88-352

Goal

To provide educational equity through technical assistance, training programs and dissemination of information to all requesting LEAs and other agencies in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of Title IV plans, programs and policies to support desegregation of public schools on the basis of race.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$ 83,038
FY 1980	86,079
FY 1981	85,286
FY 1982	92,800
FY 1983	118,963

Scope

The Oklahoma State Department of Education maintains a SEA office staffed by an administrator, assistant administrator and secretary.

The program provides technical assistance aimed at strengthening the effectiveness of personnel in all local school districts and utilizing improved and effective skills to cope with special education problems occasioned by desegregation. Technical assistance has been provided by correspondence, phone, and direct visits to numerous administrators on education matters pertaining to Title IV legislation.

Training programs were conducted for approximately 650 educators: 120 districts were served through targeted audiences including superintendents, elementary and secondary principals, teachers, directors of elementary and secondary education, school board members, librarians, methods teachers from universities and colleges, support personnel, and community persons. These training sessions were designed to promote maximum staff and community growth based on long range planning and needs of the LEAs.

Material was disseminated to 615 school districts related to the Title IV Program to assist in building an understanding for each local school district. The section utilizes the Superintendent's Newsletter, Ok'ahoma Educator, local newspapers, and educational television (OETA) to announce current information concerning the agency.

During FY 1982-83, the following workshops were conducted in the identified needs areas: Compliance and Legal Requirements for School Districts; Resource Management addressing school climate/community and parental support/educational excellence and school achievement; Multicultural Aspects of Educational Equity; Student Management; and Achievement Skills.

Workshop	Date	Location
Resource Management	August 12, 1982	Pittsburg
Resource Management	August 16, 1982	Alex
Resource Management	August 17, 1982	Dibble
Resource Management	August 18, 1982	Goodwell
Resource Management	September 23, 1982	Seiling
Student Management and Student Leadership	October 8, 1982	Sand Springs and Catoosa
Resource Management	October 28, 1982	Crutcho - OKC
Compliance Workshop Town Meeting	November 30, 1982 December 1, 1982	Hall of Fame Inn OKC
Title IV CRA Statewide Advisory Committee Workshop	January 28, 1983	State Dept. of Education OKC
Zone 4 OEA Mini Workshop	March 4, 1983	Washington School
Teacher Training Workshop	April 1, 1983	Henryetta
Multicultural Aspects of Education Equity Workshop	June 7, 1983	Central State University
Title IV CRA Statewide Advisory Committee Workshop	June 23, 1983	Rose State College

Representative Objectives

The long range goal of the SEA is to provide leadership and assistance in acquiring an equal educational opportunity for all Oklahoma students. Fiscal Year 1983 objectives were:

-- To provide technical assistance in the OCR Compliance, identification and resolution of human relations, desegregation/integration concerns and improved means for assessing school district needs

-- To enhance equal educational opportunity for all students by providing training programs for educators which emphasize improving cognitive and affective skills

-- To disseminate materials statewide for use in schools to promote cultural appreciation, motivation and positive self-concept of all students, education excellence and knowledge of new federal laws and regulations relating to Title IV CRA legislation

-- To provide leadership in evaluating the effectiveness of the technical assistance, training programs, and dissemination of materials on education excellence in Oklahoma

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The staff of the Oklahoma State Department of Education, Title IV CRA Educational Equity, encourages working cooperatively with other federally-funded programs such as the Desegregation Assistance Center, training institutes and local educational agencies. Evaluative instruments are used in training programs to measure the effectiveness of the assistance activities and utilize feedback procedures from educators. The evaluation determines the efficiency of the SEA Title IV Unit's efforts and provides data for recycling, modifying, and improving future programs. The programs have proven effective and school districts are being served to meet their requested needs. Also, according to the evaluative instruments, the training programs enhanced communication between educators, students, and parents. During FY 1983, school board members at the local level and the Title IV CRA Advisory Committee were included as a part of the evaluation process.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Involvement of the Oklahoma State Department of Education, Title IV CRA Human Relations Section, on local, state, and national levels has provided a continued awareness of school desegregation concerns. These concerns have helped educators in meeting the needs in their local schools and communities in providing equal educational opportunities for all students in the desegregation/integration process. During FY 1983, local school board members, Title IV CRA Statewide Advisory Committee, and community persons were also included in public and professional awareness and dissemination efforts. These efforts are planned for FY 1984 to improve program results. The overall partnership will enhance and build an understanding of educational equity and educational excellence in the school/community. Involvement and dissemination activities of the Human Relations Section were achieved by use of media, inservice staff development programs, training workshops, and statewide meetings of superintendents and local board members in areas of compliance and technical assistance in providing information to all of the people involved in the Title IV CRA programs.

IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAMS
STATE BLOCK GRANTS

(ECIA Chapter 2)

Common Name of the Program

Chapter 2 - Consolidation of Federal Programs for Elementary and Secondary Education

Statutory Designation

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Subtitle D, Chapter 2; Public Law 97-35

Purpose

It is the purpose of Chapter 2 of ECIA to consolidate the program authorizations of the 28 antecedent programs into a single authorization. Funds are to be used for the same purposes as the antecedent programs but in accordance with the educational needs and priorities of State and local agencies.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1983	$5,484,556

Scope

Allocations were made to every school district within the State. The allocations included funds for providing equitable services to students atending private nonprofit schools within the school district. Five hundred and seventy (570) of the State's school districts submitted an application and participated in Chapter 2. Fifty-two (52) private nonprofit schools participated through their local public school district.

The annual evaluation reports submitted by LEAs and summarized by the SEA show that approximately 96 percent of the total school enrollment in public schools of Oklahoma had an opportunity to participate in some component of the Chapter 2 program. Approximately 11,000 students attending private nonprofit schools participated in Chapter 2. The SEA has identified enrollments in private nonprofit schools totaling 26,812 students, therefore approximately 41 percent of those enrolled participated.

Chapter 2 funds were used to supplement LEA staffs with approximately 61 teachers, 6 administrative personnel, and 28 support personnel such as clerical and teacher aides.

Funds were reportedly expended in 16 of the 28 antecedent program areas and in each of the three subchapters. Approximately 3.4 percent was expended in the Basic Skills Subchapter; 90.5 percent was expended in the Educational Improvement and Supportive Services Subchapter and

6.1 percent was expended in the Special Projects Subchapter. Program areas where supplementary services were available through Chapter 2 include the following:

(1) Reading, (2) Language Arts, (3) Mathematics, (4) Career Education, (5) Arts in Education, (6) Guidance, Counseling and Testing, (7) Library/Media Materials, (8) Textbooks, (9) Gifted and Talented, (10) Instructional Equipment, (11) Local Improvement Programs, (12) Programs to Support Minority Children, (13) Teacher Training/Inservice, (14) Preschool Partnership, (15) Correction Education, (16) Desegregation Training and other incidental areas.

Representative Objectives

SEA Objective

To make Chapter 2 resources and services available to all school districts in the State of Oklahoma

LEA Objectives

To provide educational films that enhance and enrich the educational experiences for children at various instructional levels

To purchase reading materials that meet the educational needs and interests of our students

To provide opportunities for advanced work and for pursuing special interests

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Because of the flexibility of usage and the small amounts of funds most Chapter 2 programs do not lend themselves to sound objective measurement. Chapter 2 program administrators are required to include in their application some process or product evaluation plan and to report their findings to the SEA. The SEA evaluation summary included several questions designed to gather data relative to program effectiveness.

One question asked about the extent to which the program has affected the curriculum. Responses indicate that 17 LEAs feel the program had no significant effect, 505 LEAs indicated the program was valuable in its support of the existing curriculum, 246 LEAs indicated that Chapter 2 had inspired some curriculum changes and 216 LEAs indicated that much worthwhile change resulted from their Chapter 2 program.

Some other indicators of the effectiveness of Chapter 2 is found in the strengths of the program reported by LEAs. Five hundred forty-one (541) LEAs indicated that a strength of the program was that it permitted them to purchase needed additional learning resources for teachers and students. Four hundred twenty-nine (429) LEAs indicated that students were motivated through their participation in Chapter 2 programs. Five hundred forty-four (544) LEAs reported a strength in the fact that Chapter 2 expanded the LEA's offerings and increased student opportunities for learning. Three hundred fifty-three (353) LEAs indicated that

students in their projects increased their achievement levels. Seventy-two percent of the participating LEAs reported that over 50 percent of the participant needs identified relative to Chapter 2 were met through the program. This figure along with the high percentage of participants and the LEA flexibility in program designing indicates a high level of effectiveness and success in the first year of the program.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

This program was implemented under the advisement of a 22-member State Advisory Committee. The committee met four times during 1982-83.

The State Senate and the House of Representatives conducted public hearings on two different occasions. Representatives from the SEA explained the Chapter 2 program to those present and one of the hearings was via talk-back television where the public could ask questions and receive immediate responses.

The SEA conducted 14 regional workshops for the purpose of explaining Chapter 2 and how districts could participate. Articles have appeared in the SEA publications on several occasions. Information was disseminated through a Federal Programs update via OETA Channel 13 and through the Education Fair held on November 1, 1983.

Each participating LEA is required to have a local consultation committee to assist in the planning and implementing of the program. The committees are representative of the LEA staff and are required to sign the application along with the LEA administration. The total number of persons reported to have been active in the consultation role is 3,301.

JOHNSON-O'MALLEY PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934, Public Law 73-167; Public Law 95-561, Title XI

Purpose

The overall goal of the Johnson-O'Malley Program is to provide better educational opportunities for Indian Students (one-fourth or more degree Indian blood) attending public schools in Eastern Oklahoma.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$3,203,121
FY 1980	2,908,023
FY 1981	2,532,561
FY 1982	2,334,382
FY 1983	1,432,171

Scope

Number of approved programs: 217

Number of school districts participating: 122

In addition, four (4) cooperative programs are operational in areas of high Indian student concentration on a county or multi-school basis.

Number of Indian students participating in Johnson-O'Malley Programs: 8,559

For eligibility, a student need only be one-fourth or more degree Indian blood and enrolled in the public schools, grades K-12.

Total number of state and local staff:

*State Department of Education professional	9
*State Department of Education clerical	3
Local Education Agency certified staff	41
Local Education Agency non-certified staff	105

*One of the non-professional and seven of the professional State Department staff are state funded.

Johnson-O'Malley Programs funded:

Arts and Crafts	Library Aides
Music	Counselor Aides
Teacher Aides	Academic Enrichment
Cultural Trips	Vocational Enrichment

Cultural Studies	Electronics and Drafting
Counseling Program	Educational Support
Remedial Education	Home/School Aides
Tutorial Program	Computer Education

The local schools employed professional and para-professional people to implement the aforementioned programs. Methods of instruction were:

Individualized instruction	Small group participation
Audio-visual aides	Prescriptive Tutoring

Representative Objectives

All Johnson-O'Malley students will show an average NCE gain of 2.0 in academic subjects.

Johnson-O'Malley student dropout rate will decrease by 5 percent each year.

Johnson-O'Malley students shall show a measurable increase in cultural awareness as exhibited by improvement of self-image, self-worth, and greater involvement in school activities.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

A subjective evaluation of all projects is conducted by the local school administrator, local parent committee, teacher, and the Johnson-O'Malley area program facilitator. Objective measurement is achieved through pre- and post-tests in programs designed with measurable objectives. Beginning with FY 1983 the entire program is also being evaluated professionally by the Planning, Research and Evaluation Section of the Oklahoma State Department of Education for effectiveness.

The following changes resulted from Johnson O'Malley program activities:

Academic achievement levels increased by an average of 1.0 NCE.

Drop-out rates decreased by 1.0 percent.

Average daily attendance increased 0.5 percent.

The number of Indian students involved in extracurricular school activities increased by 8.0 percent.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The involvement of parents in the Johnson-O'Malley program is necessary for any measure of success. Parents have an active role in needs assessment, program planning, and program approval. In addition, they evaluate existing programs and make recommendations to the administration and the board of education.

Parent committees are established in each district which receives Johnson O'Malley funds. To be eligible to serve, the individual must be the parent, guardian or acting "in loco parentis" of an eligible student and reside in the transportation area of the school district. Inservice training programs are provided to acquaint the parents with their duties. To ensure their involvement in program development, the local administration must obtain the approval of the majority of the local committee before implementing any Johnson-O'Malley program.

K-12 TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION

Common Name of the Program

Elementary Traffic Safety
K-3 Pedestrian Safety
4-6 Pedestrian, Bicycle and Bus Safety
7-9 Traffic Safety Education

Statutory Designation

National Highway Safety Act of 1966
Standard 3 Motorcycle Safety
Standard 4 Driver Education
Standard 14 Pedestrian Safety
Standard 17 Pupil Transportation Safety

Purpose

To provide direction, materials, and expertise for teachers in schools for traffic safety education, grades K-12

State Allocation of Federal Funds

Fiscal Year	Driver Education	Elementary Traffic Safety	Total NHTSA Funds Expended
1979	$ -0-	$ 34,406	$ 34,406
1980	-0-	33,420	33,420
1981	6,100	60,353	66,453
1982	-0-	19,038	19,038
1983	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	$ 6,100	$ 147,217	$ 153,317

Scope

The K-3 and 4-6 materials are continuing to grow in popularity and their demand is stronger now than in the past. Twenty-two (22) states and subdivisions outside the state have been granted permission to print the K-3 guide. Other states are making extensive use of this material, as well as the 4-6 guide. Phase III, a guide for teaching traffic safety in grades 7-9, has been completed and is now in print. Dissemination of these guides is still in progress and they are serving a useful purpose in the schools.

Featherfoot: The Oklahoma Challenge is a program consisting of a brochure by that name, a 16 mm. film and an accompanying quiz, a miles-per-gallon dial, and a personal MPG record. These programs, purchased in FY '81, have been in continuous use in FY '82 & '83 and will continue to be used in FY '84.

One hundred ten (110) reels of safety film were purchased and placed in the Media Section Film Library for circulation to schools in 1979.

Representative Objectives

The State Department of Education will continue to conduct workshops for teachers of Traffic Safety. These workshops will introduce traffic safety materials to the teachers and assist them in developing plans for integrating traffic safety education into existing curricula.

The State Department of Education will accumulate, research and evaluate materials for new guides to continue toward the goal of K-12 Traffic Safety Education.

The State Department of Education will distribute 3,500 copies of safety film to classrooms throughout the state.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The State Department of Education will provide inservice education for teachers in K-6 elementary traffic safety. Evidence of practical, effective use of this material is provided by continuous requests for materials from in-state and out-of-state agencies. Twenty-two (22) states have requested and have been granted permission to copy all or parts of this material. Additions have been made to materials from other state sources which seem to be useful and appropriate. Local schools have developed comprehensive programs based on "Scotty" materials.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Demand for materials for Pedestrian Safety, K-3; and Pedestrian, Bus, and Bicycle Safety, 4-6 has increased. Teachers and administrators made aware of this material through workshops, publications and conventions are anxious to obtain this material for classroom use. Thus, the growing demand for materials in Oklahoma and in other states has been steadily increasing. Current nationwide emphasis on school bus safety and bicycle safety has so increased the demand for 4-6 materials as to overshadow that of the K-3. Current requests for materials seem indicative of increasing use, and further exposure always results in more requests. Youth With Wheels and Their Responsibilities, a curriculum guide and student handbook for traffic safety education in grades 7-9, is still in demand and is being used throughout the states.

NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT TRANSITION SERVICES PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965, Title I, Section 153, as amended by Public Law 95-561

Purpose

The purpose of this project was to facilitate the transition of neglected or delinquent youth from State-operated neglected and delinquent institutions into locally-operated educational programs.

Federal Funds

FY 1983 $ 65,054

Scope

This program operated as a cooperative venture between the State Department of Education and the Oklahoma City Public School System. Oklahoma City used $40,500 of the funds to implement the program in conjunction with a new district alternative school, the Skills and Academics Grant Education program (SAGE). SAGE itself was a mixture of regular school programs and vocational programs. Vocational Technical District, VT-22, provided half the instruction for the enrollees; Oklahoma City Public Schools, I-89, provided the other half.

Project staff consisted of one full-time coordinator and one full-time clerk for Oklahoma City. The State Department retained one half-time coordinator and one half-time secretary.

The State Department's component consisted of overall supervision and project administration with liaison at the state agency and state institution level. This function cleared the way to allow local educators to make contacts with officials responsible for intake and release procedures. Students returning from state institutions thus were contacted about school participation much earlier than before.

The local school component consisted of a considerable amount of social work counseling: telephone calls, address checking, visiting potential participants and their parents and guardians, working the local juvenile court systems, cooperating with community group home officials, counseling students, working with parents, and providing extra educational opportunities.

Although the focus of the project was the SAGE program on the campus of the Vocational Technical School, the coordinator worked with students who were in a variety of different placements. The coordinator worked through all the high schools in Oklahoma City, I-89, to assure that returning students had the most appropriate options for continued education.

The target students for this program were students who had been or were in the process of being released from a state institution for neglected or delinquent students. These students were wards of the State and had, after a traumatic departure from the community some months before, been receiving their schooling within the walls of secure institutions. This project aimed to facilitate their return back to the educational community and to help them complete their secondary school education as quickly and efficiently as possible. One hundred and fourteen (114) students were referred to the project. Although establishment of a regular program or even an alternative program such as SAGE for them would be higher than the cost for regular students, this project spent less than $570 per student identified. Peers of these identified students undoubtedly received some of the services, too, such as counseling, rap-session guidance, activity participation, and indirect benefits from parent training.

The project provided the initial contact sometimes involving days of the coordinator's time just to locate the student. Then, a few hours were spent helping the students decide on the options. If a student opted for SAGE, he/she was further involved in guidance sessions and other activities. For all students, the involvement time ranged from their contact with the coordinator after their release from the state institution to the end of the school year.

The project lasted from October 1, 1982, to June 30, 1983.

Representative Objectives for the program include the following:

-- Have all students returning to the Oklahoma City Public Schools from state N & D institutions enrolled in an appropriate school program;

-- Improve student attendance and achievement;

-- Have students aware of more life and educational options; and

-- Improve the skills and attitudes of parents and teachers in working with these students.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Although the SAGE program enrolled 264 students, no more than 162 were served at any one time. Of the 114 identified post-institutionalized students only 38 participated in the SAGE program. Two received GED diplomas. Only six were reinstitutionalized. Two were known to have moved from the area. Ten were not interested in school, but preferred to go right into work. TWenty-seven were still active in the alternative school at the end of the year. Only one was dropped from the program. The remaining number of the original 114 could not be found with the information available.

Of the 27 students who participated in the schooling long enough to get grades in their language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies areas, 15 had a grade point average of above 2.0; 11 below 2.0; and one above 3.0. Seventy-three percent had an improved self concept and respect for others. Eighty-four had improved attendance, and 69% were planning to return to school in the fall.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

A parent advisory committee was formed of 8 people. They began to have meetings for the parents in November. A district-wide liaison and advisory committee of professionals were also formed of 7 people. Three staff sessions were held in November to facilitate progress of the students. Training coordination was also accomplished for students. During November students spent five whole days on such things as developing awareness of self and related to school life and promoting self responsibility as a vital skill in life. Monthly sessions were held for all participants in addition to individual counseling. Parents' responses to their meetings were very positive also. Meetings were held with agencies and with legislators to address the problems. State human relations workshops were also involved in disseminating the project.

Although this was a one year program, it was agreed by all participants that it should be continued and expanded as funds may be made available.

SCHOOL BUS DRIVER TRAINING PROGRAM

Program Title

Pupil Transportation

Statutory Designation

National Highway Safety Act of 1966
Standard 17 Pupil Transportation Safety

Purpose

To provide training, materials, and certification for school bus drivers

State Allocation of Federal Funds

Fiscal Year	Personnel and Training Materials	State Matching	Total
1979	$56,331.08	$49,725.00	$106,056.08
1980	80,283.30	52,950.00	133,233.30
1981	42,437.00	55,000.00	97,437.00
1982	55,712.00	60,000.00	115,712.00
1983	72,904.20	86,264.00	159,168.20
Totals	307,667.58	303,939.00	611,606.58

Scope

State Department of Education Transportation Specialists conducted 76 workshops and provided materials to each class participant. In a cooperative effort with the Department of Public Safety Examiners and Highway Patrolmen, 3,416 school bus drivers were trained.

Representative Objectives

The State Department of Education will conduct 79 School Bus Driver Training Workshops during the 1982 fiscal year.

Transportation Specialists will train 1,020 school bus drivers during a 5 day (25-hour) training course and recertify 1,160 drivers during renewal sessions.

Eleven-hundred (1,100) copies of the School Bus Drivers Manual will be distributed to drivers during the workshops.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The State Department of Education conducted 76 School Bus Driver Training Workshops during the 1982 fiscal year.

During the School Bus Drivers Training Workshops, Transportation Specialists and the office personnel distributed 2,280 School Bus Driver Manuals.

As a result of the workshops, a total of 3,612 drivers were certified with standard school bus driver certificates. Actually enrolled in the training classes were 2,445 drivers; 1,088 attended renewal sessions during the year.

Accident records indicate that drivers who have not attended the 5-day school bus driver workshop and possessed only a one time non-renewable, emergency certificate were involved in 43.9% of the school bus related accidents. Only 6.3% of all drivers were classified as untrained.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Transportation materials pertaining to school bus driver workshop schedules, manuals, evacuation drills, safety, films, and other related training information, have been mailed to 850 school district superintendents, county superintendents, principals, drivers, and patrons.

CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Sections 810 and 820, Public Law 97-35, the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981; Section 2, Public Law 95-627, 92 Statute 3603 (42 U.S.C. 1766); Section 10, Public Law 89-642, 80 Statute 889 (42 U.S.C. 1779)

Purpose

To assist States to initiate, maintain and expand nonprofit food service programs for children in nonresidential institutions which provide child care. The Child Care Food Program funds meal service in eligible programs and provides training for food service personnel to create an awareness of good nutrition for children. In the past, reimbursement has been available for partial funding of kitchen equipment through the Food Service Equipment Assistance Program.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$2,302,522	$73,214	(Food Service Equipment Assistance)
FY 1980	2,908,536	59,115	(Food Service Equipment Assistance)
FY 1981	3,104,902	46,374	(Food Service Equipment Assistance)
FY 1982	2,969,716	-0-	(Funding no longer available)
FY 1983	3,577,552	-0-	(Funding no longer available)

SCOPE

The Child Care Food Program (CCFP) is administered by the Assistant State Superintendent and Director of the School Lunch Division and staffed with one (1) administrator, one (1) administrative assistant, four (4) consultants, and two (2) secretaries.

The Program presently reaches 176 institutions that operate 394 facilities and five (5) sponsoring organizations that operate 334 day care homes. These facilities serve approximately 15,000 children a day. Three of the consultants offer assistance to participants so that they remain in compliance with Federal regulations, assist with the completion of various forms for CCFP, and conduct workshop training. The fourth consultant works in the state office in planning workshops and nutrition training.

Representative Objectives

-- To reach needy children with food service in public or private nonprofit institutions and private for profit institutions which receive Title XX compensation for at least 25% of the children enrolled, especially those located in economically needy areas

-- To improve the overall accountability and quality of participants

An outreach program is initiated each year to encourage eligible institutions to participate in the program.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Each institution and facility is monitored by the CCFP consultants to ensure that all participants are in compliance with State and Federal regulations and guidelines. Audits are also used to ensure compliance.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The Child Care Food Program regulations outline requirements. The CCFP consultants aid the institutions in developing their programs to ensure compliance with the regulations.

Continued contact by mail, telephone and the consultants allows the state office to keep participants informed of requirements. Workshops are conducted during the year in various locations throughout the State to assist personnel in maintaining and upgrading their work efforts.

Outreach efforts include working with other State Agencies. Outreach brochures explaining the Child Care Food Program are made available to the Licensing Unit of the the Department of Human Services and to the State Health Department. These agencies come into contact with every eligible, but not participating, institution at least once a year.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Sections 2-12, 60 Statute 230, as amended; Section 10, 80 Statute 889, as amended; 84 Statute 212 (42 U.S.C. 1751-1760, 1779)

Purpose

To improve the health and well being of the school children of Oklahoma by offering a nutritionally adequate, acceptable lunch for all students. Surveys show that many students do not consume an adequate lunch and that there is a correlation between diet and performance in the classroom.

State Allocation of Federal Funds		State Appropriation	State Matching Funds
FY 1979	$25,410,476	-0-	$1,744,567
FY 1980	29,910,681	-0-	1,726,948
FY 1981	30,288,585	-0-	2,275,539
FY 1982	26,233,167	-0-	2,230,528
FY 1983	30,082,008	$5,236,209	2,272,267

Scope

The National School Lunch Program is administered by the Assistant State Superintendent and Director of School Lunch Division, one (1) administrator, one (1) coordinator, one (1) financial manager, three (3) administrative assistants, three (3) claims clerks, two (2) secretaries, and eleven (11) area consultants.

The program is presently in 1,847 public schools and institutions with an average daily participation of 330,079.

Representative Objectives

-- To make available to all students enrolled in public schools and institutions a lunch during a period designated as the lunch period

-- To provide nutritionally adequate meals that are acceptable to students, thus reducing plate waste

-- Provide assistance to participants to ensure minimum meal requirements are met

-- Provide assistance to participants to ensure all programs are accountable

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Approximately 330,079 students per day are eating school lunches in Oklahoma. All but one public school in the state operate the National School Lunch Program. In addition to the public schools, 19 residential child care institutions are being reimbursed for meals served to children. This was approximately 57,223,101 lunches last year.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The Federal regulations spell out the requirements and the State Education Agency passes this information on to the schools through fact sheets. In addition, the school lunch consultants make regularly scheduled visits to schools to ensure that requirements are being met, to make available technical assistance, to ensure state sanitation standards are met, to provide workshops for food service personnel, and to conduct management reviews.

NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Child Nutrition Act of 1966, Public Law 95-166, as amended October, 1977, Section 19

Purpose

The purpose of the program is to instruct teachers, students, and food service personnel in sound principles of nutrition education; train food service personnel in the principles and practices of food service management; and develop and use classroom materials and curricula.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$314,869
FY 1980	256,879
FY 1981	188,226
FY 1982	53,215
FY 1983	55,939

Scope

Program staff for Fiscal Year 1983 included an Administrative Officer, one Nutrition Training Specialist, and a Secretary.

An extensive resource library of audiovisual materials for use by classroom teachers and school food service personnel is available to all school districts through the State Department of Education Media Resource Center. Included in these resources are six (6) slide-tape presentations which have been produced by Nutrition Education and Training (NET) staff.

"Soup to Nuts," an instructional television series for middle schools, was aired spring semester of 1982-83. This series of ten programs, each fifteen minutes in length, was produced as a consortium effort of nine (9) states, including Oklahoma. Teacher's guides for this series are available on request. Airing of this series is scheduled during the spring semester of 1983-84 school year.

NET staff provided planning, coordination and resource provision services for all School Lunch workshops during the summer of 1983 with 1,351 school food service personnel attending. It is anticipated that an equal number will be trained in 1984.

The curriculum guide, Creative Nutrition Education-An Integrated Approach, K-6, is currently being distributed statewide. Approximately 8,750 copies of this guide have been distributed to date. This guide was developed and originally printed with program funds. The School Lunch Division reprinted 5,000 copies of the guide in September, 1983. NET staff will continue distribution and training teachers for classroom utilization of this resource.

In-service workshops at the local level for 784 classroom teachers were provided by Nutrition Education and Training specialists during the fall semester, 1982. These workshops included the following topics.

High School Level (9-12):	"Weight Control" and "Nutrition for the Athlete"
Middle School Level (7-8):	T.V. Series --- "Soup to Nuts"
Elementary Level (K-6):	Curriculum Guide - "Creative Nutrition Education"

The School Lunch Division is providing classroom teaching resources for the secondary level, completing the long range goal of providing resources for students and teachers from preschool through high school level. "Food, Fitness and You," a teaching unit of four lessons, complete with spirit masters and four filmstrips with one cassette, will be promoted and distributed during school year 1983-84 by Nutrition Education and Training Program staff.

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Sections 4 and 10, 80 Statute 886, 889 (42 U.S.C. 1773, 1779)

Purpose

Surveys show that breakfast is important in maintaining the health and well-being of school children and that a number of students do not eat an adequate breakfast at home.

There is documented evidence that students who do not eat breakfast do not perform well in the classroom.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$2,577,876
FY 1980	3,323,706
FY 1981	4,123,733
FY 1982	3,862,664
FY 1983	4,341,639

Scope

The School Breakfast Program is administered by the same State Education Agency staff as the National School Lunch Program.

The program is in 712 public schools and institutions with an average daily participation of 51,231.

Representative Objectives

-- Make breakfast available in schools for students who for various reasons come to school without an adequate breakfast

-- Increase the number of school breakfast programs by continuing to notify all nonbreakfast program schools as to the availability of the program

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

A total of 8,928,785 breakfasts were served to students last year.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

In addition to interpreting Federal regulations and assisting the schools with meeting requirements through visits by school lunch consultants, the State Education Agency strives through fact sheets and other information to enlighten students, parents, school administrators and teachers of the nutritional needs of all students and the importance of good nutrition to start the day.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Sections 3 and 10, 80 Statute 885, 889, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 1772, 1779)

Purpose

To ensure the availability of fluid milk to children, to reduce the price to children who pay for their milk and to serve milk free to eligible children under USDA guidelines

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$1,144,497
FY 1980	1,180,699
FY 1981	782,331
FY 1982	66,091
FY 1983	13,813*

Scope

The Special Milk Program is administered by the same State Agency staff as the Child Care Food Program.

The program presently reaches two (2) nonresidential institutions and one (1) summer camp.

*The decrease in participation is a result of changes in Federal Regulations and the State Attorney General's Opinion #82-68.

Representative Objectives

-- Encourage the participation of schools and eligible institutions

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Approximately 118,768 half pints of milk were served to children under the Special Milk Program last year.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The State Agency interprets regulations to participants. An effort to initially establish lunch and breakfast programs in schools having the facilities and ability to serve meals is made before approval of the Special Milk Program.

SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Statutory Designation

Sections 803, 807, 809, 816, and 817, Public law 97-35; Sections 203, and 206, Public law 96-499; Sections 5, 7, 10, Public law 95-627, 95 Statute 3603 (42 U.S.C. 1771); Section 2, Public law 95-166, 91 Statute 1325 (42 U.S.C. 1961); Section 7, Public Law 91-248, Statute 211 (42 U.S.C.) (1859a)

Purpose

Provide nutritional help to children age 18 and younger who would otherwise be deprived of the food assistance they get at other times of the year under the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program. Persons over 18 years of age determined by the State or local educational agency to be mentally or physically handicapped and participating in a public program established for the mentally or physically handicapped are also eligible.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$774,772
FY 1980	668,012
FY 1981	559,858
FY 1982	332,588
FY 1983	334,467

Scope

The Summer Food Service Program is the responsibility of the nonschool program administrator and staffed with one (1) administrative assistant, one (1) clerk-typist and six (6) summer monitors.

Representative Objectives

-- To make nutritious meals available to all preschool and school age children from needy areas

-- To encourage, where possible, other organized activities for children at the site locations and to improve overall accountability and quality of the Summer Food Service Program for Children

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The 1983 Program consisted of thirty (30) sponsors and 67 feeding locations. Approximately 4,800 needy children were fed daily.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The State Agency notifies prospective sponsors well in advance of program availability. Sponsors are asked to attend a planning meeting early in the spring. At least three (3) workshops are held in different locations of the State to acquaint sponsors with the requirements and forms pertaining to the program. As information and materials are received by the State Agency, they are passed on to sponsors to aid them in having a quality program. During the program's operation, the summer monitors make regular visits to sponsors and sites to ensure requirements are being met and provide technical assistance to improve the quality of the food service.

SCHOOL PLANT SERVICES SECTION

The goal of the School Plant Services Section of the State Department of Education (SDE) is to provide assistance and services that will help the LEAs enhance educational opportunities.

The School Plant Services Section administers a number of Federal and State programs. Those programs are:

Public Law 81-874, Impact Aid
Public Law 81-815, School Construction
Major Disaster Assistance
School Plant Assistance
Energy - Schools and Hospitals Program; Energy Conservation
Public Law 93-112, Section 504, Handicapped; Subpart C, Building Accessibility
Special programs or concerns that affect the school plant

Some of the major accomplishments of the Section were: Conducted 90 workshops on energy conservation; provided technical assistance on-site to 74 districts; and assisted 60 districts in implementing an energy management program.

Under the Impact Aid Program, the Section assisted 368 districts in filing their RSF-1 application, one (1) Public Law 81-815 application and sixteen (16) Public Law 81-874 Disaster Applications; held two (2) statewide workshops on Impact Aid; provided technical assistance to 185 districts in addition to filling out the RSF-1 applications.

IMPACT AID PROGRAM

Statutory Designation

Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 403(1) of Public Law 81-874; and Section 305(b)(2) of Public Law 93-380, as amended by Public Law 95-561

Purpose

To provide to the school districts of the State assistance and service that will help the local educational agencies (LEAs) enhance educational opportunity

State Allocation of Federal Funds

	Sections II & III	Disaster Assistance
FY 1979	$18,272,031	No Funding
FY 1980	19,044,011	No Funding
FY 1981	22,915,232	No Funding
FY 1982	14,301,969	$223,422
FY 1983	25,130,937	118,104

Scope

The School Plant Services Section administers Public Law 81-874, Impact Aid Program; Public Law 81-815, Construction Program; and any program relating to school facilities and energy.

The program is administered by one secretary, one administrative assistant, and one administrator. There are five additional personnel who work on the Energy program.

In recognition of the responsibility of the United States for the impact which certain Federal activities have on the local educational agencies in areas in which such activities are carried on, the Congress through Public Law 81-874 provides financial assistance for those LEAs upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact:

(1) The revenues available to such agencies from local sources have been reduced as the result of the acquisition of real property by the United States since 1938; or

(2) Such agencies provide education for children residing on federal property; or

(3) Such agencies provide education for children whose parents are employed on federal property; or

(4) There has been sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities.

To quality for Impact Aid, the number of eligible students must be at least three percent of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance (ADA) during such year at the schools of such agency and for whom such agency provided free public education and provided that the ADA of the eligible students is at least ten. Also, an LEA may qualify by having an ADA of 400 eligible students.

The RSF-1 application must be submitted before January 31. However, if a district wishes to file for early payment, it must submit "A Letter of Intent to Apply" before October 1.

All funds received by the school district with the exception of funds received for the "Low Rent Housing" and "Indian and Military Handicapped" can be deposited in the General Fund and spent in whatever way the local board so decides.

Public Law 81-874 also provides assistance to LEAs who have suffered a natural disaster. If a school is located in an area designated by the Governor's office and President of the United States as a major disaster area, it may be eligible for financial assistance. Funds are available to supplement the replacement of both building and contents.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

The unique part of the Public Law 81-874 program is that it is general aid and can be used by the district to meet the needs of the district whatever they may be. There are no requirements put on how the money is to be spent except with low rent housing students and handicapped students. This allows a superintendent to build buildings, pay for textbooks, etc.

The Impact Aid Program has proved effective. Without this aid many schools could not operate effectively on a tax base with present Federal tax exemptions.

The School Plan Services Section:

-- Distributed and in most cases filled out, typed, and made copies of 345 RSF-1 applications; submitted three copes of each to Washington, DC; and returned one copy to the applicant by January 31, 1982.

-- Made on-site visits, appraised damage, filled out and mailed 16 applications under Public Law 81-874 (Major Disaster).

-- Helped organize and accompanied an Oklahoma delegation to Washington, DC, to secure funding for Public Law 81-874.

-- Participated in two Federal Programs workshops in explaining Public Law 81-874, Public Law 81-815, and new Energy Program legislation.

-- Worked on-site with the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) officer in auditing and reviewing 40 school district's Public Law 81-874 applications.

-- Provided information through the Superintenent's Newsletter, direct correspondence, and telephone calls to superintendents, Public Law 81-874 authorized representatives, and other interested personnel on Public Law 81-874, Public Law 81-815, Major Disasters, and new Energy Programs affecting school plants.

-- Provided technical assistance to approximately 300 districts on interpretation of payment sheets and related problems.

-- Made approximately 75 telephone calls to Washington, DC, and the USDE on behalf of school districts having problems with Public Law 81-874.

-- Submitted 98 "Letters of Intent to Apply" to the USDE asking for immediate payments.

-- Furnished statistical data to the USDE on all school districts in the State. Provided the USDE with the following information: Name of district, total ADA, revenue receipts for current expenses from all sources, current expenses paid from local sources, total current expenditures, local contribution rate, per pupil cost, legal classification, grade level, percent of pupils transported, pupil-teacher ratio, total assessed valuation of property for school purposes, school tax rate, estimated percent of change in state average per pupil cost from 1981-82, actual 1982-83 per pupil cost, and actual cost for those that have been accepted as comparables.

-- Compiled budget information on 350 school districts from school budgets in the Board of Equalization office.

PUBLIC EDUCATION ENERGY PROGRAM

(Elementary Energy Education)

Statutory Designation

Public Law 95-39, Part A, Section 465.6. Grant from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Services Division

Purpose

To broaden the reach of current energy programs to include participation of children and educators at the elementary level. Past efforts at energy education relied heavily on the simple dissemination of materials in the form of cartoons, bright colors and lots of pictures to overcome the static nature of energy education. In this program we have used a combination of live action, humor, full costumes and a professional presentation of ideas on a personal basis to reach children in grade levels K-6.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1981	$39,200	Direct grant from Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Services Division. No state or other funding; one year funding only.
FY 1982	$21,560	Direct grant from Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Services Division No state or other funding; one year funding only.
FY 1983	$50,000	Direct grant from Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Services Division. No state or other funding; one year funding only.

Scope

This program is administered the same as the Energy Grants Program. Assistance with project planning has been provided by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Planned milestones and activities resulting in actual performances in 120 elementary schools were scheduled. Results with elementary children were better than expected. Performances were presented to more than 20,000 students in grades K-6 in the public schools of Oklahoma. The performances were well received by students and school personnel.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

-- Development of script, costumes, scenery, puppets, for use in the assembly program in schools

-- Publication of information concerning program

-- Development of energy materials to be disseminated at performances

-- Meeting with Energy Conservation Services personnel and participation in State Energy Workshops and meetings

PUBLIC EDUCATION ENERGY PROGRAM

(Energy Conservation)

Statutory Designation

Title I, Part C, Section 301 of the National Energy Act. Grant from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Division

Purpose

To develop a statewide energy conservation program for schools. To provide technical assistance to local school districts on a voluntary basis to enable them to develop energy conservation and management plans and implement low-cost energy conservation measures to reduce energy consumption in school facility operations.

To develop various types of energy audit materials for use by school children in grades K-6.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$31,280	Direct Grant from Oklahoma Department of Energy. No state or other funding; one year funding only.
FY 1980	$20,332	Direct grant from Oklahoma Department of Energy. No state or other funding; one year funding only.
FY 1981	$33,317	Direct grant from Oklahoma Department of Energy No state or other funds; one year funding only.
FY 1982	$87,625	Direct grant from Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Division. No state or other funding; one year funding only.
FY 1983	$88,572	Direct grant from Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation division. No state or other funding; one year funding only.

Scope

This program is administered the same as the Energy Grants Program. Assistance with project planning and conducting workshops has been provided by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission.

Various types of audit materials appropriate for use by elementary school children were developed for use in the elementary school energy conservation program.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Accounting forms to assess school energy savings have been developed and delivered to schools for completion on a voluntary basis. Preliminary results are indicating significant savings in terms of reduced energy consumption. Demand for the energy conservation assistance as well as number of districts assisted is in excess of grant requirements.

The materials developed for school children have been used by 30,000 students in 110 schools. The materials have been printed and are available for continued use in other schools.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Major project activities are summarized as follows:

-- The SDE staff has assisted 90 districts in on-site establishment of energy conservation and management plans.

-- A slide presentation to graphically illustrate the development of an energy conservation and management plan was developed.

-- Publication of the availability of energy conservation materials to the schools of the state has been undertaken. The emphasis of this program has been designed to cause school children to become more aware of the need for energy conservation.

-- Other activities include meetings with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Energy Conservation Division, and participation in state and national energy workshops and meetings.

PUBLIC EDUCATION ENERGY PROGRAM

(Energy Grants)

Statutory Designation

Title III of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act of 1978, Public Law 95-619, Grants Program for Schools and Hospitals, and Buildings Owned by Units of Local Government and Public Care Institutions

Purpose

To reduce the consumption and associated costs of conventional energy resources and encourage the use of renewable energy resources, identify improved energy conservation measures, and facilitate their installation

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$157,794	Matching grant with the Department of Energy. Matching accomplished with funds from State Department of Vo-Tech Education, in-kind match from SDE, in-kind match from LEAs
FY 1980-81	$39,706	Matching grant with the Department of Energy. Matching accomplished with funds from State Department of Vo-Tech Education, in-kind match from SDE, in-kind match from LEAs
FY 1982	$19,128	Matching grant with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Conservation Services Division. Matching accomplished with funds from State Department of Vo-Tech Education, in-kind match from SDE, in-kind match from LEAs
FY 1983	$20,000	Matching grant with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Conservation Services Division. Matching accomplished with funds from State Department of Vo-Tech Education, in-kind match from State Department of Education, in-kind match from LEAs

Scope

This program is administered by an Assistant Administrator of Energy Programs, and one administrative technician, under the direct supervision of the Administrator of School Plant Services. Assistance with project planning and conducting workshops has been provided by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Conservation Services Division.

The program has the potential to enable the 615 school districts of Oklahoma to save or "cost avoid" an estimated $10,625,000 annually on energy costs (based on present cost structures).

Representative Objectives

-- To achieve significant reductions (5-30 percent) in energy consumption in school facilities via increased awareness of the effects of operation and maintenance on utility usage as identified in an energy audit

-- To enable school districts to save or "cost avoid" significant expenditures for energy

-- To enable as many school districts as possible to participate in receiving Federal grants

-- Assistance to help reduce or alleviate districts' worst building energy problems

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Four hundred eighty (480) districts have conducted preliminary energy audits and 310 districts have additionally conducted a full energy audit. Furthermore, preliminary energy audits and energy audits have been conducted of all 34 area vo-tech schools. Results indicate an average potential for savings in the range of 20-25 percent for all fuels combined. Schools which have actually followed the audit reports and implemented operations and maintenance activities recommended have verified that even larger savings than reported are possible. Demand for energy audits has produced a backlog of work which may take a year or more to complete with resources and manpower available.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Major Project activities are summarized as follows:

-- The Energy Audits for Schools booklet was again distributed.

-- The State Department of Education staff has assisted 290 districts in performing on-site energy audits.

-- Articles concerning energy programs and good energy practices for schools were written and distributed through the Superintendent's Newsletter and the Oklahoma Educator.

-- Twenty-seven (27) districts applied for Federal Grants for Technical Assistance and Energy Conservation Measures. Applications were reviewed for conformance with the state plan guidelines and forwarded to the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Conservation Services Division, for ranking and funding.

-- One hundred five (105) districts have received or have been recommended for approval of grants totaling in excess of $2,000,000.

-- State Department of Education staff worked directly with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Conservation Services Division, to develop the State Plan for Participation in the Grants Program.

-- Other activities include: Meetings with Oklahoma Corporation Commission, Conservation Services Division; presentations at the State ASBO meeting; presentations at the State School Plant Manager's Workshop; participation in National Energy Workshops and meetings; and participation in the Governor's Energy Awareness Conference.

-- A statewide workshop was conducted for local educational agencies. Focus was on training local school districts to apply for the fourth cycle of Federal Energy Grants. Application booklets and instructions were distributed.

-- School Plant Services furnished technical assistance to the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (successor to the Oklahoma Department of Energy) during the fourth grant cycle in order that this program not be interrupted during the transition from one agency to another.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS FOR
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Common Name of Program

EHA-B (Education of the Handicapped Act - Part B)

Statutory Designation

Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, Public Law 91-230, as amended by Public Laws 93-380 and 94-142

Purpose

To assure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate education

To assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected

To assist states and localities to provide for the education of handicapped children

To assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate such children

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$ 7,528,703
FY 1980	11,954,145
FY 1981	13,416,260
FY 1982	13,487,420
FY 1983	14,661,636

Scope

For FY '79, 122 Flow-Through projects were funded in the amount of $5,636,007. There were 35 Discretionary projects funded in the amount of $597,645. A total of 18,940 handicapped students were served with Flow-Through funds and 1,875 handicapped students were served with Discretionary funds. Also in FY '79, 18 Inservice projects were funded in the amount of $200,000.

In total, $7,664,605 supported 278 EHA-B projects and served 22,975 handicapped students with FY '78 carry-over and FY '79 funds.

For FY '80, 153 Flow-Through projects were funded in the amount of $8,330,600. There were 98 Discretionary projects funded in the amount of $2,615,605 from FY '79 carry-over and FY '80 funds. A total of 22,612 handicapped students were served with Flow-Through funds and a total of 8,021 handicapped students were served with Discretionary funds. Also in FY '80, 20 Inservice Projects were funded in the amount

of $415,687. A total of 9,383 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

Within the Special Education Section, a total of 14 workshops and inservice programs were funded from FY '80 funds in the amount of $30,283. A total of 725 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

In total, $11,361,892 supported 271 EHA-B projects and served a total of 30,633 handicapped students and a total of 11,900 personnel were trained through Inservice programs.

For FY '81, 170 Flow-Through projects were funded in the amount of $9,443,840. There were 82 Discretionary projects funded in the amount of $1,747,089 from FY '80 carry-over and FY '81 funds. A total of 25,108 handicapped students were served with Flow-Through funds and a total of 5,680 handicapped students were served with Discretionary funds. Also in FY '81, 20 Inservice Projects were funded in the amount of $424,634. A total of 14,707 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

Within the Special Education Section, a total of 30 workshops and inservice programs were funded from FY '81 funds in the amount of $80,572. A total of 650 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

In total, $13,416,260 supported 272 EHA-B projects and served a total of 30,788 handicapped students and a total of 20,954 personnel were trained through Inservice programs.

In FY '82, 178 Flow-Through projects were funded in the amount of $10,648,616. There were 64 Discretionary projects funded in the amount of $1,526,960 from FY '81 carry-over and FY '82 funds. A total of 31,333 handicapped students were served with Flow-Through funds and a total of 1,532 handicapped students were served with Discretionary funds. Also in FY '82, 20 Inservice Projects were funded in the amount of $369,965. A total of 8,723 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

Within the Special Education Section, a total of 48 workshops and inservice programs were funded from FY '81 funds in the amount of $188,844. A total of 12,231 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

In total, $13,487,420 supported 242 EHA-B projects and served a total of 32,865 handicapped students and a total of 20,954 personnel were trained through Inservice programs.

In FY '83, 187 Flow-Through projects were funded in the amount of $10,840,324. There were 77 Discretionary projects funded in the amount of $1,689,100 from FY '82 carry-over and FY'83 funds. A total of 29,320 handicapped students were served with Flow-Through funds and a total of 638 low incidence, severely handicapped students were served with Discretionary funds. Also in FY '83, $286,803 of Flow-Through funds were

earmarked for Inservice projects. A total of 8,835 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

Within the Special Education Section, a total of 75 workshops and inservice programs were funded from FY '82 carry-over funds in the amount of $202,293. A total of 16,281 teachers, teacher aides, and other personnel received training.

In total, $14,661,636 supported 264 EHA-B projects and served a total of 29,958 handicapped students and a total of 25,116 personnel were trained through Inservice programs.

Representative Objectives

The objective is to provide opportunities for the handicapped student to advance at his/her own rate of educational development within the limits of his/her capabilities.

Specific project objectives are established for the following handicapping conditions:

Trainable Mentally Retarded	Blind and Partially Sighted
Educable Mentally Handicapped	Speech Impaired
Learning Disabled	Emotionally Disturbed
Deaf	Orthopedically Handicapped
Deaf-Blind	Other Health Impaired
Multi-handicapped	Hard of Hearing

Specific Objectives are also established for:

Inservice	Search/Find/Serve Activities
Parent Training	

Accomplishment of these objectives is based on performance reports which indicate the number of special classes provided by the type of handicapping condition, number of handicapped students served, and the number of teachers employed and/or needed as of December 1 of the year in question. On-site reviews conducted by the Special Education Section staff, Regional Education Service Center staff, and Area Supervisors also provide input to help determine the accomplishment of objectives.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

As a result of the FY '83 search/find/serve projects, local school districts across the state remained aware of the extent of their need to extend special education programs and services to handicapped students. A total of 63,995 children were counted as served. This increased awareness was reflected for state special programs funding for school year 1983-84.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Local Education Agencies making project application as single districts or cooperative districts completed their own needs assessment, developed an application based on identified needs, and submitted the

application to the Special Education Section, EHA-B Review Team, for approval.

Coordination with other agencies for services, dissemination of project activities, workshops, newsletter, and publishing newspaper articles regarding services available were all a part of the project application. These activities were designed to make the entire state aware of the availability of services to handicapped children.

The Special Education Section of the State Department of Education also publishes articles in the Superintendent's Newsletter and other State Department of Education communiques to aid in this effort.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS
FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN STATE INSTITUTIONS

Common Name of Program

Institutional Handicapped Children

Statutory Designation

Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Chapter 1, Public Law 97-35; (formerly Public Law 89-313)

Purpose

Financial assistance is provided to state agencies for programs to meet the special education needs of handicapped children in state operated or state supported schools. In addition, funds may now be available by those state agencies to local education agencies under certain conditions for handicapped children who have left a state agency program and are now enrolled in a local educational agency program.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$ 812,137
FY 1980	966,571
FY 1981	926,157
FY 1982	1,076,424
FY 1983	992,109

Scope

Nine approved state institutions receive funds from the Program for Education of Handicapped Children in State Operated or Supported Schools; Chapter 1, ECIA (formerly Public Law 89-313). Those institutions are as follows:

Hissom Memorial Center
514 students; 19 staff

Hilltop School for Mentally Retarded
402 students; 28 staff

Jane Brooks School for the Deaf
38 students; 4 staff

Phil Smalley Children's Center
43 students; 2 staff

Oklahoma School for the Deaf
144 students; 11 staff

Cherokee Park School for Mentally Retarded
359 students; 23 staff

Oklahoma State School for the Blind
121 students; 7 staff

OU Health Sciences Center; Pre-School for the Deaf
10 students; 1 staff

J. D. McCarty Center
38 students; 2 staff

LEAs Receiving Reserve Monies

Alex	$ 489	Ardmore	4,403
Braggs	489	Chickasha	7,338
Claremore	978	Cushing	978
Edmond	489	Elgin	489
Harrah	978	Lawton	2,935
Lomega	489	McLoud	489
Midwest City-Del City	4,403	Millwood	489
Muldrow	1,957	Moore	21,525
Norman	1,467	Muskogee	5,381
Oklahoma City	34,244	Nowata	489
Prague	978	Pioneer	489
Sand Springs	489	Putnam City	6,360
Tecumseh	489	Skelly	489
Watonga	978	Tulsa	16,144

Representative Objectives

Each institution writes an annual application applying for these funds. Included in the application is a section for detailed description of their objectives and goals. If a local school district is serving a formerly institutionalized student, they can apply for reserve monies and must make application for funds to serve that particular child. Utilization of monies for handicapped children will vary a great deal from one institution to another. Also, utilization by a local school district will vary depending on the child's handicap, the IEP written for the child, etc.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Evaluation procedures are also a part of the application. Detailed descriptions of their evaluation process are required in each application.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS
FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Common Name of Program

Pre-School Incentive Grants for Handicapped Children Ages 3-5

Statutory Designation

Section 619 of Education of the Handicapped Act of 1975, as amended by Public Law 94-142

Purpose

To encourage early programming for handicapped pre-school children in order to:

-- Provide programs for handicapped children in accordance with State and Federal Statutes for children age 3-5

-- Prevent additional or more severe handicapping conditions and realize greater long term cost effectiveness through early intervention

-- Increase parent and community involvement in the development of children; and

-- Maximize the benefit of the rapid learning phase of young children.

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$ 247,039
FY 1980	342,879
FY 1981	517,501
FY 1982	520,691
FY 1983	549,543

Scope

Proposals were awarded on a priority and competitive basis to ten geographic areas. The recipients for respective areas included Alva, Stillwater, Moore, Soper, Weatherford, Poteau, Cache, Bartlesville, Cushing, and Muskogee. Twenty-four teachers were employed for instructional purposes. Social services, parent training, medical consultation, physical therapy, psychological services, recreation therapy and transportation were contracted through the respective projects.

The respective projects served the following areas:

Alva - Region I
Alfalfa County
Beaver County
Cimarron County
Dewey County
Ellis County
Grant County
Harper County
Major County
Texas County
Woods County
Woodward County

Weatherford - Region II
Roger Mills County
Beckham County
Greer County
Custer County
Washita County
Caddo County
Grady County
Stephens County

Cache - Region III
Kiowa County
Jackson County
Harmon County
Comanche County
Cotton County
Tillman County

Stillwater - Region IV
Kay County
Garfield County
Noble County
Pawnee County
Blaine County
Kingfisher County
Logan County
Pawnee County
Payne County
Canadian County

Cushing - Region V
Creek County
Lincoln County
Okfuskee County
Oklahoma County

Moore - Region VI
Cleveland County
Coal County
Garvin County
McClain County
Pottawatomie County
Seminole County
Pontotoc County

Soper - Region VII
Jefferson County
Carter County
Love County
Murray County
Johnston County
Marshall County
Bryan County
Atoka County
Choctaw County
Pushmataha County
McCurtain County

Bartlesville - Region VIII
Osage County
Washington County
Nowata County
Rogers County
Mayes County
Craig County
Ottawa County
Delaware County

Muskogee - Region IX	Poteau - Region X
Tulsa County	Hughes County
Wagoner County	McIntosh County
Okmulgee County	Pittsburg County
Cherokee County	Latimer County
Muskogee County	Haskell County
	Sequoyah County
	Adair County
	LeFlore County

Representative Objectives

The basic objective is to promote early identification and programming for pre-school handicapped children as defined in Public Law 94-142.

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Approximately 4,161 pre-school children are being served in the respective areas. In addition, there were 6,338 children screened and 1,078 evaluated this year. In-service training was provided for 695 teachers, parents and administrators.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

LEAs submitted proposals to provide services to pre-school handicapped children in respective areas. The EHA-B Advisory Panel and Regional Education Service Centers, LEA organizations, other agencies, and universities have provided information regarding needs and feasible solutions in their respective areas.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECT
SERVICES FOR DEAF-BLIND CHILDREN

Statutory Designation

Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI, Part C, Section 622, Public Law 91-230

Purpose

To provide coordinated services for all deaf-blind children 0-21 years of age

To improve competency of parents, teachers, and ancillary staff working with deaf-blind children

To disseminate information regarding services available to deaf-blind children

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1979	$ 85,899
FY 1980	21,509
FY 1981	82,985
FY 1982	45,000
FY 1983	20,000

Scope

A deaf-blind coordinator is employed to work with all deaf-blind service programs and other agencies to assure the existence of appropriate services, monitor the continuum of services available to deaf-blind individuals; provide information to parents about deaf-blind services and programs and other community resources; survey existing and potential resources for vocational and recreational opportunities; consult with and facilitate the exchange of information between deaf-blind services to professionals and the general public, and report referrals and updates to the regional registry; and provide home-based education and family services when needed. During FY 82-83, 278 deaf-blind children received services.

Tulsa operates a public school program for deaf-blind children, ages 0-21 years. Through federal, state and local contributions, a full range of diagnostic and full-time educational services are available. Twenty deaf-blind children were enrolled in the program during FY 82-83. This project provides continuation of the program for two months in the summer.

Representative Objectives and Evidence of Program Effectiveness

Continue to identify deaf-blind children. There were 35 new referrals made during FY 82-83.

Assist in placing referred children in appropriate programs. One hundred thirteen (113) children received full-time educational programs, 61 were in part-time educational programs, 23 were in home programs, 5 were in residential-medical programs, 7 were awaiting placement in the evaluation center, 5 received rehabilitation evaluation or training, 2 were in no program, and 19 were unknown.

Provide information to parents about deaf-blind programs, other community resources, and legislation through an annual statewide workshop and other means deemed appropriate. In addition to 257 individual family contacts, a statewide parent and sibling workshop was held. Twenty one (21) parents attended.

Provide inservice training to personnel working with deaf-blind children and their families. Workshops were held in the state to assist teachers, social workers, and other ancillary personnel in the areas of teacher/child relationships, methods materials, co-active movement, orientation and mobility, handling and positioning, language stimulation, family assessment, and evaluation.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

Information is disseminated through meetings, workshops, and personal contacts.

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL INSERVICE PROGRAMS AND TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

Statutory Designation

Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI, Part D, Public Law 91-230, as amended by Public Law 94-142

Purpose

To provide training for general/special educators and parents for the purpose of increasing their skills in providing an appropriate education for the handicapped students

State Allocation of Federal Funds

1979	95,000	
1980	200,000	
1981	200,000	
1982	200,000	
1983	-0-	($30,000 c/o implemented during school year)

Scope

Inservice training was provided for parents of handicapped children to improve parenting skills and communication between parents, school personnel, and other special services providers.

A special workshop was conducted to update the information concerning individual assessment of children to be used by administrators and psychometrists.

Representative Objectives and Activities

-- To update special education certified personnel to work with handicapped children

-- To provide parents with an opportunity to receive training experience in parenting skills and communication

-- To maintain an on-going comprehensive system of personnel development

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

As a result of the special inservices, educators and parents are better prepared to provide an appropriate education for handicapped students. During the school year 1982-83, all identified handicapped students had an IEP prepared for them and a special program implemented.

TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

Common Name of the Program

Transition Program for Refugee Children

Statutory Designation

Refugee Act of 1980, Public Law 96-212

Purpose

To provide Federal assistance to states in order to assist local educational agencies to provide supplemental educational services to the Indochinese refugee children enrolled in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools

State Allocation of Federal Funds

FY 1980	$131,218
FY 1981	207,488
FY 1982	206,419
FY 1983	278,133

Scope

The Oklahoma State Department of Education received a grant of $278,133 from the U.S. Department of Education for the Transition Program for Refugee Children. One percent of the grant ($2,704.76) was allocated to the Oklahoma SDE for administration of the statewide program. The LEA subgrants were determined by a formula which gave consideration to the number of students, grade level of the students, and the date of arrival in the United States. The following 14 local educational agencies were awarded subgrants according to the number of eligible refugee students enrolled in school as of May 20, 1982:

LEA	Number of Refugee Students	Amount of Subgrant
Ardmore	26	$ 4,055
Bartlesville	15	2,364
Enid	31	4,036
Lawton	353	60,305
Midwest City-Del City	24	3,497
Moore	14	2,344
Muskogee	10	1,674

Oklahoma City	947	157,755
Pioneer-Pleasant Vale	2	372
Putnam City	25	3,738
Shawnee	4	521
Stillwater	11	1,432
Tulsa	215	32,551
Weatherford	6	781
TOTAL	1,683	$275,428

Representative Objectives

-- To provide inservice training for the teachers and tutors to assist them in improving their skills in teaching the Indochinese students

-- To develop the English language proficiencies of each student in order that the student can acquire a functional level of communicative skills

-- To provide individualized and small group instruction to produce proficiency in English

-- To provide inservice training to assist teachers with cross-cultural knowledge of students' heritage and culture

-- To provide special materials for teaching English as a second language to facilitate individualized instruction for these students

-- To employ personnel to provide supplementary educational services to Indochinese students

Evidence of Program Effectiveness

In the performance report submitted, the LEAs all reported satisfaction with the attainment of the objectives established for their programs. The LEA administrators have indicated verbally and in writing that a majority of the Indochinese students have adapted to the Oklahoma public schools extremely well and are achieving on an appropriate level. We feel supplementary services offered have been a key to permitting these students to adapt to a new language and educational system.

A majority of the refugee students are highly motivated in relation to educational objectives. In a relatively short period of time most of the students are mainstreamed into the regular classes. Some of the schools have reported students with learning disabilities requiring special education, speech therapy, and other remedial services. Their overall evaluation of the Transition Program for Refugee Children in Oklahoma indicates above average success in accomplishing the objectives.

Involvement and Dissemination Activities

The U.S. Department of Education regulations under the Transition Program for Refugee Children required that "each participating LEA shall take steps to provide parents of eligible children an opportunity to become effectively involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of LEA services provided."

The Oklahoma Department of Education disseminated information regarding the program through the Oklahoma Educator and the Superintendent's Newsletter. Many of the LEAs published articles in their local newspapers regarding the Indochinese Refugee program.

SUMMARY

The purposes of this report as listed in the introduction were to describe the functioning of the Division of State-Federal Programs, increase understanding of various programs and provide information about the achievement of objectives. The report does not attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of all evaluative data. The report utilizes selected, representative data to provide information about the local implementation of federally-funded programs. Both data gathering and data analysis used anecdotal rather than normative techniques. Such a technique allowed for collecting similar data about widely differing programs yet elicited the quantitative data needed for this report.

Functions of the Division of State-Federal Programs

Evidence that the Division fulfilled its function of providing technical assistance in the planning and developing of proposals and programs is the existence of locally initiated programs summarized within the report. Programs generally require that a proposal be written or an application completed. Assistance was provided relative to these efforts; all proposals and applications were reviewed before funds were granted. Programs were further supported through technical assistance in implementation, monitoring visits, consultation, program evaluation and recommendations.

Several federally-funded categorical educational programs terminated at the end of FY 1982. Numerous of these terminations were a direct result of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981 which also resulted in the implementation of ECIA Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 (State Block Grants) programs in FY 1983. Twenty-eight (28) formerly categorical educational programs were consolidated into the Chapter 2 Block Grants programs.

The ECIA Chapter 1 programs in many respects functionally continue the old ESEA Title I programs.

Programs in this report last year which no longer received categorical funding in FY 1983 include Arts in Education, Basic Skills Improvement (Reading Program), Dissemination Capacity Building (Project SEEK), ESEA IV-B (Instructional Materials and School Library Resources), Gifted and Talented Education, ESEA V-B (Strengthening SEA Management), and Women Into the Superintendency Position (Project WISP). Due to the manner in which projects were funded, ESEA IV-C (Improvement in Local Educational Practice) projects were funded in FY 1983 but this is the final year of federal funding for this program.

In addition to the ECIA Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 reports, one other new one-year program appears in this report; this the Neglected or Delinquent Transition Services Program.

Each program provides some form of workshop, seminar, consultation or assistance to facilitate planning and/or implementation. Examples,

several of which are noted in individual program sections of this report (and others which are not) include:

The Federal Programs Division revised the District Annual Evaluation Summary of Federal Programs consolidated report form and used it to collect program participation and evaluation data on the following programs: Regular ECIA Chapter 1; ECIA Chapter 1 Migrant Education; ECIA Chapter 1 Neglected, Delinquent, and Correctional; ECIA Chapter 1 Institutional Handicapped; ESEA IV-C (Improvement in Local Educational Practice); ECIA 2-A (Basic Skills Development); ECIA 2-B (Educational Improvement and Support Services); and ECIA 2-C (Special Projects).

Fourteen (14) regional workshops were conducted to instruct and assist LEA personnel in completing the report. Packets containing two sets of the report form, all pertinent instructions, and data worksheets were distributed to district representatives participating in the workshops. Regional workshops participation totaled 667 individuals representing 454 school districts and several county superintendent's offices. Evaluation packets were mailed to 142 program districts and 68 county superintendents of schools which were not represented in one of the regional workshops. Some form of follow-up technical assistance was provided by the Planning, Research, and Evaluation (PRE) Section to over 100 districts.

Districts returned this report summary to the PRE Section where the report was checked prior to being taken to the Data Section for data entry. Reports submitted which contained obviously erroneous entries and/or were incomplete were returned to the district for confirmation of data, correction, and/or completion. A letter and items checklist which specified items requiring further attention accompanied each of the reports returned to districts. The PRE Section works with the Data Center to determine the program for and format of the computer printout of program data. Once computer printouts of program data are available in final form, a copy of the printout for each program on the consolidated report form is provided to the program administrator and to higher level administrators in the SDE. This evaluation information is used in conjunction with information taken from district applications and proposals and SDE fiscal records to prepare reports required by federal regulations. Information processed from data collection is thus made available for use by decision-makers. Evaluation data and information in summary form is shared with district personnel via subsequent workshops, meetings, and publications. Summary information is available to other interested individuals upon request.

The ESEA Title IV-C program again conducted the annual fall Proposal Writer's Conference. The conference provided LEA personnel interested in developing proposals for funds to improve educational opportunities in their district with a general overview of purposes, guidelines and procedures applicable to the proposal process. Specifics relative to needs assessment, goals and objectives writing, program expectations and requirements, evaluation design and measurement, involvement of non-public schools, implementation,

record-keeping, and dissemination were addressed. In the ensuing months, follow-up assistance was provided to LEAs in the forms of brainstorming, planning for and developing needs assessment approaches, analyzing needs, and providing technical assistance in the writing of proposals.

Inservice and staff development training continued to be a major activity due at least in part to House Bill 1706.

The Oklahoma State Department of Education continued its involvement in projects with the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Activities provided through the Regional Planning and Service Project focused upon Micro-computers, Effective Schools, Local District Foundations, and Principal's Leadership Skills.

Understanding Federal Programs

Goals listed for Federal Programs focused attention on the equalization of educational opportunity, the improvement of educational opportunity, the improvement of education, and the support of selected educational functions. A summary view of the programs suggests that these goals are approached through the programs included in this report.

The tabulation which follows the contents pages lists each program with its title designation and legislative source. The purposes of the program listed at the beginning of individual reports indicate the variety of ways programs are designed to work toward goal attainment. For example, special educational opportunities were provided for undereducated adults, migrant children, handicapped disadvantaged persons, and individuals who were incarcerated. Children in public and private schools and teachers of special groups as well as mainstream classes are provided with learning facilities and opportunities from other sources of funding.

Objectives of Federal Programs

In the introduction of this report four objectives were listed for the federal programs described. Data were collected and organized to reflect efforts made toward the achievement of each of the objectives.

Activities of the Division are designed to:

Objective 1: Ensure that the scope of local projects is adequate to accomplish the purpose of the program.

Each program description gives the scope of the program, usually in terms of students and school staff. Number of students in individual programs ranged from 20 students served by the Tulsa program for the deaf-blind to the 63,597 students served in the program for the educationally disadvantaged. Several program descriptions list the LEAs involved to show availability of services throughout the state.

Objective 2: Facilitate the development of objectives whose accomplishment will achieve the goals of the programs.

Evidence of the successful development of objectives is to be found in each report. Objectives focused upon diverse aspects of learning ranging from pre-school incentives to adult basic education. When proposals and applications were received, objectives were carefully reviewed to compare their relationship to the purpose of the program. If changes were needed, technical assistance, consultation, and recommendations were available to the local education agencies.

Objective 3: Validate the local evaluation of programs to ensure that projects have accomplished objectives and use evaluation information to improve programs.

Evidence that projects have accomplished objectives is presented in the section of each report entitled "Evidence of Program Effectiveness." Evidence of program effectiveness is varied and includes:

-- Chapter I involved 61,690 participants (unduplicated count) in educational programs during the regular term of the 1982-83 school year. Of these students, 44,755 received instruction in reading; 10,257 received instruction in language arts, and 20,739 received instruction in mathematics. Some students were provided instruction in more than one subject area. Chapter I served 1,907 participants in summer school.

-- Regular term Chapter I students made an overall average Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) gain of 6.52 in reading; 5.48 in language arts; and 7.58 in mathematics.

The Chapter I programs employed 1,840 full-time equivalent educational staff during the 1982-83 regular term; this includes 1,219 teachers and 551 teacher aides; others are administrative, clerical, support services, curriculum specialists, and other.

-- Migrant education programs provided services to 6,599 students in 34 districts. Average NCE gains were 5.10 in reading, 4.19 in language arts, and 5.54 in mathematics.

-- ESEA Title IV-C funded 78 projects in districts which provided educational services to about 12,090 participants.

-- The Planning, Research, and Evaluation Section conducted research studies and surveys; provided technical assistance to other SEA sections in developing proposals for funds, technical assistance to LEAs, technical assistance in conducting needs assessments; conducted inservice education on technical subjects related to planning, research, and evaluation; and coordinated the activities of the Federal Proorams Division Annual Evaluation procedure for LEAs with Federal programs.

Objective 4: Monitor activities designed to involve participants and other citizens in planning and implementing programs.

The final section of each report describes the way individuals who will be directly served by the program are involved in planning and how others are informed about the program. Listed are advisory committees for Chapter I, Chapter 2, IV-C, and others; articles in SEA news publications; education fairs; interagency cooperation; participation by civic and service organizations; distribution of pamphlets and brochures; and presentations in meetings and on television.

The data included in this report and the evaluation efforts these data represent indicate that federal programs make an impact on education far beyond the proportion of funds invested. In some way every student in Oklahoma has benefited by projects or materials initiated through federal programs. For some groups the special effects of federal programs have made possible a productive educational experience which otherwise would not have been feasible.